DUKE
UNIVERSITY

DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

THE CHURCH

HER BOOKS AND HER SACRAMENTS

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

IN WATCHINGS OFTEN: Addresses to Nurses and Others. With a Preface by the Right Rev. EDWARD KING, D.D., late Bishop of Lincoln. With a Frontispiece (the Crucifixion, by PERUGINO). Crown 8vo, sewed, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s. 6d.

IMMORTALITY. Crown 8vo, 5s. (*The Oxford Library of Practical Theology.*)

RESPONSIBILITY: an Address to Girls. 16mo, paper covers, 1d. net, or bound in rexine, 1s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.,

LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA.

THE CHURCH

HER BOOKS AND HER SACRAMENTS

BY

E. E. HOLMES

HON. CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH, AND OF THE ROYAL CHAPEL OF ST. KATHARINE

A COURSE OF INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN AT ALL SAINTS, MARGARET STREET, IN LENT, 1910

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA
1910

Div. S.
283.42
H749C

TO

H. F. B. M.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Duke University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/churchherbookshe01holm

INTRODUCTION

THESE Lectures were originally delivered as the Boyle Lectures for 1910, and were afterwards repeated in a more popular form at All Saints, Margaret Street. They are now written from notes taken at their delivery at All Saints, and the writer's thanks are due to the kindness of those who lent him the notes. Some explanation of their elementary character seems called for. The Lecturer's object was twofold :—

(1) To remind an instructed congregation of that which they knew already—and to make them more grateful for the often underrated privilege of being members of the Catholic Church ; and

(2) To suggest some simple lines of instruction which they might pass on to others. Unless the instructed Laity will help the Clergy to teach their uninstructed brethren, a vast number of

Church people must remain in ignorance of their privileges and responsibilities. And if at times the instructed get impatient and say, "Everybody knows that," they will probably be mistaken. Many a Churchman is ignorant of the first principles of his religion, of why he is a Churchman, and even of what he means by "the Church," just because of the false assumption—"Everybody knows". Everybody does not know.

It seems absurd to treat such subjects as *The Church, Her Books, Her Sacraments,* in half-hour Lectures; but, in spite of obvious drawbacks, there may be two advantages. It may be useful to take a bird's-eye view of a whole subject rather than to look minutely into each part—and it may help to keep the Lecturer to the point!

E. E. H.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	Introduction	vii
I.	The Church	1
II.	The Church's Books (1) The Bible	21
III.	„ „ (2) The Prayer Book	40
IV.	The Church's Sacraments	58
V.	Baptism	63
VI.	The Blessed Sacrament	81
VII.	The Lesser Sacraments	92
VIII.	Confirmation	94
IX.	Holy Matrimony	106
X.	Holy Order	123
XI.	Penance	144
XII.	Unction	158
	Index	165

Dear Saviour! make our hearts to burn,
And make our lives to shine,
Oh! make us ever true to Thee,
And true to all that's Thine—
Thy Church, Thy Saints, Thy Sacraments,
Thy Scriptures; may we own
No other Lord, no other rule,
But Thee, and Thine alone.

A. G.

THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH ON EARTH.

Christus Dilexit Ecclesiam: "Christ loved the Church"[1]—and if we love what Christ loved, we do well.

But three questions meet us:—

(1) What is this Church which Christ loved?

(2) When and where was it established?

(3) What was it established for?

First: *What is the Church?* The Church is a visible Society under a visible Head, in Heaven, in Paradise, and on Earth. Who is this visible Head? Jesus Christ—visible to the greatest number of its members (i.e. in Heaven and in Paradise), and vicariously represented here by "the Vicar of Christ upon Earth," the Universal Episcopate.

[1] Eph. v. 25.

Next: *When and where was it established?* It was established in Palestine, in the Upper Chamber, on the first Whitsunday, "the Day of Pentecost".

Then: *What was it established for?* It was established to be the channel of salvation and sanctification for fallen man. God may, and does, use other channels, but, "according to the Scriptures," the Church is the authorized channel.

As such, let us think of the Church on earth under six Prayer-Book names:—

(I) The Catholic Church.
(II) The National Church.
(III) The Established Church.
(IV) The Church of England.
(V) The Reformed Church.
(VI) The Primitive Church.

(I) The Catholic Church.

The Creeds call it "the *Catholic* Church" and describe its doctrine as "the *Catholic* Religion," or the "*Catholic* Faith". The Te Deum, Litany, and Ember Collect explain this word "Catholic" to mean "the holy Church *throughout all the*

world," "*an universal* Church," "*thy holy* Church *universal*"; and the Collect for the King in the Liturgy defines it as "the *whole* Church".

The "Catholic Church," then, is "the whole Church," East and West, Latin, Greek, and English, "throughout all the world".[1] Its message is world-wide, according to the terms of its original Commission, "Go ye into *all the world*".

Thus, wherever there are souls and bodies to be saved and sanctified, there, sooner or later, will be the Catholic Church. And, as a matter of history, this is just what we find. Are there souls to be saved and sanctified in Italy?—there is the Church, once with its local headquarters at Rome. Are there souls to be saved and sanctified in Russia?—there is the Church, once with its local

[1] The primary meaning of the word Catholic seems to refer to world-wide extension. St. Augustine teaches that it means "Universal" as opposed to particular, and says that "The Church is called Catholic because it is spread throughout the whole world". St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: "The Church is called Catholic because it extends throughout the whole world, from one end of the Earth to the other," and, he adds, "because it teaches universally all the doctrines which men ought to know" ("Catechetical Lectures," XVIII. 23).

headquarters at Moscow. Are there souls to be saved and sanctified in England?—there is the Church, with its local headquarters at Canterbury. It is, and ever has been, one and the same Church, "all one man's sons," and that man, the Man Christ Jesus. The Catholic Church is like the ocean. There is the Atlantic Ocean, the Indian Ocean, the Pacific Ocean: and yet there are not three oceans, but one ocean. The Atlantic Ocean is not the Indian Ocean, nor is the Indian Ocean the Pacific Ocean: they are all together the one universal ocean—"the ocean".

But, after all, is not this a somewhat vague and nebulous conception of "The Church". If it is to go into all the world, how, from a business point of view, is this world-wide mission, in all its grandeur, to be accomplished? The answer is seen in our second name:—

(II) The National Church.

For business and administrative purposes, the world is divided into different nations. For business and practical purposes, the Church follows the same method. The Catholic Church is the channel of "saving health to all nations". As at Pentecost the Church, typically, reached "every

nation under heaven," so, age after age, must every nation receive the Church's message. The Universal Church must be planted in each nation —not to denationalize that nation; not to plant another National Church in the nation; but to establish itself as "the Catholic Church" in that particular area, and to gather out of it some national feature of universal life to present to the Universal Head. Thus, a National Church is the local presentment of the Catholic Church in the nation. As Dr. Newman puts it: "The Holy Church throughout all the world is manifest and acts through what is called *in each country*, the Church Visible".

As such, the duty of a National Church is two-fold. It must teach the nation; it must feed the nation. First: it is the function of the National Church to teach the nation. What is its subject? Religion. It is to teach the nation religion—not to be taught religion by the nation. It is no more the State's function to teach religion to the authorities of the National Church[1] than it is the

[1] "Foul fall the day," writes Mr. Gladstone, "when the persons of this world shall, on whatever pretext, take into their uncommissioned hands the manipulation of the religion of our Lord and Saviour."

function of the nation to teach art to the authorities of the National Gallery. Nor, again, is it the function of a National Church to teach the nation a *national* religion ; it is the office of the Church to teach the nation the *Catholic* religion—to say, in common with the rest of Christendom, "the Catholic religion is this," and none other. Thus, the faith of a National Church is not the changing faith of a passing majority ; it is the unchanging faith of a permanent Body, the Catholic Church. Different ages may explain the faith in different ways ; different nations may present it by different methods ; different minds may interpret it in different lights ; but it is one and the same faith, "throughout all the world".

A second function of the National Church is to feed the nation—to feed it with something which no State has to offer. It is the hand of the Catholic Church dispensing to the nation "something better than bread". When a priest is ordained, the Bishop bids him be "a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments," and then gives him a local sphere of action "in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto".[1] Ideally, this

[1] Service for "The Ordering of Priests".

is carried out by the parochial system. For administrative purposes, the National Church is divided into parishes, and thus brings the Scriptures and Sacraments to every individual in every nation in which the Catholic Church is established. It is a grand and business-like conception. First, the Church's *mission*, "Go ye into all the world"; then the Church's *method*—planting itself in nation after nation "throughout all the world"; dividing (still for administrative purposes) each nation into provinces; each province into dioceses; each diocese into archdeaconries; each archdeaconry into rural deaneries; each rural deanery into parishes; and so teaching and feeding each unit in each parish, by the hand of the National Church.

All this is, or should be, going on in England, and we have now to ask when and by whom the Catholic Church, established in the Upper Chamber on the Day of Pentecost, was established in our country.

(III) The Established Church.

The Catholic Church was established, or re-established,[1] in this realm in the year

[1] There was, of course, an ancient British Church long before the sixth century, and there is evidence that it existed

597.[1] It was established by St. Augustine, afterwards the first Archbishop of Canterbury. How do we know this? By documentary evidence. This is the only evidence which, in such a case, is final. If it is asked when, and by whom, our great public schools were established, the answer can be proved or disproved by documents. If, for instance, it is asked when, and by whom, *Winchester* was established, documents, and documents only,

in the middle of the second century. It sent bishops to the Council of Arles in 314, and there is a church at Canterbury in which Queen Bertha's chaplain celebrated some twenty-five years before the coming of Augustine. But its origin is shrouded in mystery, and it had been practically extinguished by Jutes, Saxons, and Angles before Augustine arrived. "Of the ancient British Church," writes Bishop Stubbs, in an unpublished letter, "we must be content to admit that history tells us next to nothing, and that what glimmerings of truth we think we can discover in legend grow fainter and fainter the more closely they are examined. Authentic records there are none." Some ascribe the first preaching of the Gospel in Britain to St. Peter, others to St. Paul, or St. James, or St. Simon Zelotes, and the monks of Glastonbury ascribe it to their founder, Joseph of Arimathea, who was, they say, sent to Britain by St. Philip with eleven others in A.D. 63. Cf. letter of Dr. Bright to "The Guardian," 14 March, 1888, and see "Letters and Memoirs of William Bright," pp. 267 *seq.*

[1] i.e. the English, as distinct from the British Church.

can answer the question—and documents definitely reply : in 1387, by William of Wykeham ; if it is asked when, and by whom, *Eton* was established, documents answer : in 1441, by Henry VI ; if it is asked when, and by whom, *Harrow* was established, documents respond : in 1571, by John Lyon ; if it is asked when, and by whom, *Charterhouse* was established, documents again reply : in 1611, by Sir Thomas Sutton. It can all be proved by, and only by, documentary evidence. So with the sects. Documents can prove that the Congregationalists established themselves in England in 1568, under Robert Brown ; Quakers in 1560, under George Fox ; Unitarians in 1719, under Samuel Clarke ; Wesleyans in 1799, under a Wesleyan Conference. Records exist proving that these various sects were established at these given dates, and no records exist proving that they were established at any other dates. So with the Church. Records exist proving that it was established by Augustine, in England, in 597, and no records exist even hinting that it was established at any other time by anybody else.

"*As by Law Established.*"[1]

A not unnatural mistake has sometimes arisen from the phrase "*as by law* established". Where is this law? It does not exist. No law ever established the Church of England. The expression refers to the protection given by law to the Catholic Church in England, enabling it to do its duty in, and to, the country. It tells of the legal recognition of the Church in the country long before the State existed; it expresses the legal declaration that the Church of England is not a mere insular sect, but part of the Universal Church "throughout all the world". A State can, of course, if it chooses, establish and

[1] "The word Establishment," writes Bishop Stubbs, "means, of course, the national recognition of our Church as a Christian Church, as the representment of the religious life of the nation as historically worked out and by means of property and discipline enabled to discharge, so far as outward discharge can insure it, the effectual performance of the duties that membership of a Christian Church involves. It means the national recognition of a system by which every inch of land in England, and every living soul in the population is assigned to a ministration of help, teaching, advice, and comfort of religion, a system in which every English man, woman and child has a right to the service of a clergyman and to a home of spiritual life in the service of the Church" ("Visitation Charges," p. 303).

endow any religion — Mohammedan, Hindoo, Christian, in a country. It can establish Presbyterianism or Quakerism or Undenominationalism in England if it elects so to do; but none of these would be the Church of Jesus Christ established in the Upper Chamber on the Day of Pentecost. As a matter of history, no Church was ever established or endowed by State law in England.[1] If such a tremendous Act as the establishment of the Church of England by law had been passed, it is obvious that some document would attest it, as it does in the case of the establishment of the Scotch Presbyterian Church in the reign of William III. No such document exists. But an authentic

[1] A State can, of course, *endow*, as well as establish, any form of religion it selects. It has a perfect right to do so. But the State has never endowed the Church of England, and it can only disendow it in the sense that it can rob it of its own endowments—just as it can, by Act of Parliament, rob any business man of his money. It has done this once already. At the Great Rebellion, the Church of England was, in this sense, disestablished and disendowed. By the Act of Uniformity of Charles II, it was reinstated into the rights and liberties from which it had been deposed. But it remained the same Church which Augustine established in England all the time. Its reinstatement no more made the Church a new Church, than the restoration of Charles II made the monarchy a new monarchy.

record does exist proving the establishment of the Pentecostal Church in England in 597.[1] It is this old Pentecostal Church that we speak of as the Church of England.

(IV) The Church of England.

Who gave it this name? The Pope. It was given by Pope Gregory in a letter to Augustine. In this letter[2] Gregory speaks of three Churches

[1] It is sometimes asked, Does not the presence of the Bishops in the House of Lords constitute an Established Church? No. Representatives from all the sects might, and some probably will, sit there without either making their sect the established Church of the country, or unmaking the Catholic Church the Church of the country. Bishops have sat in the House of Lords ever since there has been a House of Lords to sit in, but neither their exclusion, nor the inclusion of non-Bishops, would disestablish the Church of England.

It is also asked, do not the Prime Ministers make the Bishops? Prime Ministers, as we shall see, do not *make* but *nominate* the Bishops.

[2] Augustine is worried, as we are worried, by the variety of customs in different Churches, and asks Pope Gregory "why one custom of masses is observed in the Holy Roman Church and another in the Church of the Gallic Provinces". "My brother knows," replied Gregory, "the custom of the Roman Church in which he was brought up. But my pleasure is that you should, with great care, select whatever you think will best please Almighty God wherever you

—the Church of Rome, the Church of Gaul, and the *Church of the English*, and he bids Augustine compile a Liturgy from the different Churches for the "Use" of the Church of England.

We see, then, that the Church of England is the Catholic Church in England. As the Church of Ephesus is the Catholic Church in Ephesus, or the Church of Laodicea is the Catholic Church in Laodicea, or the Church of Thyatira the Catholic Church in Thyatira, so the Church of England is the Catholic Church in England. Just as St. Clement begins his Epistle to the Corinthians with, "The *Church of God*, which is at Rome, to the *Church of God* which is at Corinth," so might Archbishop Davidson write to the Italians, "The *Church of God*, which is at Canterbury, to the *Church of God*, which is at Rome". It is in each case, "the Church of God," "made visible," in the nation where it is planted.

find it, whether in the Church of Rome, or in the Church of Gaul, or in any other Church, and then plant firmly in the Church of the English that which you have selected from many Churches. . . . Choose, then, from each individual Church things pious, religious, righteous, and having, as it were, collected them into a volume, deposit them with the minds of the English as their custom, their Use."

But, being national (being, for example, in England), it is, obviously, subject to the dangers, as well as the privileges, of national character, national temperament—and, in our case, national insularity. The national presentment of the Catholic Church may err, and may err without losing its Catholicity. The Church of England, "as also the Church of Rome, hath erred";[1] it has needed, it needs, it will need, reforming. Hence we come to our fifth name:—

(V) The Reformed Church.

The name is very suggestive. It suggests two things—life and continuity.

First, *life*. A reforming Church is a living Church. Reformation is a sign of animation, for a dead organism cannot reform itself. Then, *continuity*. The reformed man, must be the same man, or he would not be a reformed man but somebody else. So with the Church of England. It would have been quite possible, however ludicrous, to have established a new Church in the sixteenth century, but that would not have been a reformed Church, it would have been

[1] Art. XIX.

another Church—the very last thing the Reformers contemplated.

A Reformed Church, then, is not the formation of a new Church, but the re-formation of the old Church.

How did the old Church of England reform itself? Roughly speaking, the English Reformation did two things. It affirmed something, and it denied something.

First, it affirmed something. For instance, the Church of England affirmed that the Church in this country in the sixteenth century was one with the Church of the sixth century. It affirmed that it was the very same Church that had been established in Palestine on the Day of Pentecost, and in this realm by Augustine in 597. It re-affirmed its old national independence in things local just as it had affirmed it in the days of Pope Gregory. It re-affirmed its adherence to every doctrine[1] held by the undivided Church, without adding thereto, or taking therefrom.

[1] "I protest," wrote Archbishop Cranmer, "and openly confess that, in all my doctrine, whatsoever it be, not only I mean and judge those things as the Catholic Church, and the most holy Fathers of old, with one accord, have meant and judged, but also I would gladly use the same words which they used, and not use any other words, but to set my

Then, it denied something. It denied the right of foreigners to interfere in purely English affairs; it denied the right of the Bishop of one National Church to exercise his power in another National Church; it denied the claim of the Bishop of Rome to exercise jurisdiction over the Archbishop of Canterbury; it denied the power of any one part of the Church to impose local decisions, or local dogmas, upon any other part of the Church.

Thus, the Reformation both affirmed and denied. It affirmed the constitutional rights of the Church as against the unconstitutional claims of the Pope, and it denied the unconstitutional claims of the State as against the constitutional rights of the Church.

Much more, very much more, "for weal or for woe," it did. It had to buy its experience. The Reformation was not born grown up. It made its mistakes, as every growing movement will do. It is still growing, still making mistakes, still purging and pruning itself as it grows; and it is still asserting its right to reform itself where it

hand to all and singular their speeches, phrases, ways, and forms of speech, which they did use in their treatise upon the Sacraments, and to keep still their interpretation."

has gone wrong, and to return to the old ideal where it has departed from it. And this old ideal is wrapped up in the sixth name :—

(VI) The Primitive Church.

Re-formation must be based upon its original formation if it would aim at real reform. It is not necessarily a mechanical imitation of the past, but a genuine portrait of the permanent. It is, then, to the Primitive Church that we must look for the principles of reformation. If the meaning of a will is contested years after the testator's death, reference will be made, as far as possible, to the testator's contemporaries, or to writings which might best interpret his intentions. This is what the English Reformers of the sixteenth century tell us that they did. They refer perpetually to the past ; over and over again they send us to the "ancient fathers,"[1] as to those living and writing nearest to the days when the Church was established, and as most likely to know her mind. They go back to what the "Commination Service" calls "The Primitive Church". This "Primitive Church" is the Reformed Church now established in England.

[1] See Preface to the Prayer Book.

The Reformers themselves never meant it to be anything else, and would have been the first to protest against the unhistoric, low, and modern use of the word "established". In this sense, they would have been the sturdiest of sturdy "Protestants".

And this word Protestant reminds us that there is one more name frequently given to the Church of England, but not included in our scheme, because found nowhere in the Prayer Book.

The Protestant Church.

The term is a foreign one—not English. It comes from Germany and was given to the Lutherans in 1529, because they protested against an edict[1] forbidding them to regulate their own local ecclesiastical affairs, pending the decision of a General Council.

It had nothing whatever to do with "protesting" against ceremonial. The ceremonial of the Church in Lutheran Germany is at least as carefully elaborated as that seen in the majority of English churches.

Later on, the term was borrowed from the Germans by the English, and applied to Church-

[1] The Edict of the Diet (or Council) of Spires.

men who protested (1) against doctrines held *exclusively* by Rome on the one hand, and by Lutherans and Calvinists on the other; and (2) against claims made by the King over the rights and properties of the Church. Later still, it has been applied to those who protest against the ancient interpretation of Prayer-Book teaching on the Sacraments and Ceremonial.

There is, it is true, a sense in which the name is fairly used to represent the views of all loyal English Churchmen. Every English Churchman protests against anything unhistoric or uncatholic. The Church of England does protest against anything imposed by one part of the Church on any other part of the Church, apart from the consent of the whole Church. It does protest against the claims of Italy or of any other nation to rule England, or to impose upon us, as *de fide*, anything exclusively Roman. In this sense, Laud declared upon the scaffold that he died "a true Protestant"; in this sense, Nicholas Ferrar, founder of a Religious House in Huntingdonshire, called himself a Protestant; in this sense, we are all Protestants, and in this sense we are not ashamed of our unhistoric name.

In these Prayer-Book names, then, we see (1) that the Church on earth is a society, established in the Upper Chamber on the Day of Pentecost; (2) that it was established to be the ordained and ordinary channel through which God saves and sanctifies fallen man; (3) that, in order to accomplish this, and for business and administrative purposes, the Church Catholic establishes itself in national centres; (4) that one such national centre is England; and (5) that this Pentecostal Church established in England is the Church which "Christ loved," the *Sponsa Christi*, the "Bride of Christ":—

Elect from every nation,
Yet one all o'er the Earth.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH'S BOOKS.

For the purpose of these lectures, we will select two :—

(1) *The Bible*, the possession of the whole Church.

(2) *The Prayer Book*, the possession of the Church of England.

(1) The Bible.

And notice : *first, the Church ; then, the Bible* —first the Society, then its Publications ; first the Writers, then the Writings ; first the Messenger, then the Message ; first the Agent, then the Agencies.

This is the Divine Order. Preaching, not writing, was the Apostolic method. Oral teaching preceded the written word. Then, later on, lest this oral teaching should be lost, forgotten, or misquoted, it was gradually committed to manu-

script, and its "good tidings" published in writing for the Church's children.

It is very important to remember this order ("first the Church, and then the Bible"), because thousands of souls lived and died long before the New Testament was written. The earliest books of the New Testament (the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians) were not written for twenty years after the Day of Pentecost; the earliest Gospel (St. Mark) was not committed to writing before A.D. 65. And, even if the Bible had been written earlier, few could have read it; and even then few could have possessed it. It was a rare book, wholly out of reach of "the people". The first Bible was not printed until 1545.

But, thank God, the Church, which wrote the book, could teach without the book; and we may be sure that no single soul was lost for the want of what it could not possess. "Without a Bible," says St. Irenæus, writing in the second century, "they received, from the Church, teaching sufficient for the salvation of their souls."

Then, again, the Church alone could decide which books were, and which books were not, "the Scriptures". How else could we know? The society authorizes its publications. It affixes

its seal only to the books it has issued. So with the Divine Society, the Church. It affixes its seal to the books we now know as the Bible. How do we know, for instance, that St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians are part of the Bible, and that St. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians is not part of the Bible? Because, and only because, the Church has so decided. If we had lived in the days of persecution it would have made a considerable difference to us whether this or that sacred book was included in the Christian Scriptures. Thus, when the early Christians were ordered by Diocletian to "bring out their books," and either burn them or die for them, it became a matter of vital importance to know which these books were. Who could tell them this? Only the society which published them, only the Church.

Again, the Church, and only the Church, is the final *interpreter* of the Bible—it is the "*witness* and keeper of holy writ".[1] The society which publishes a statement must be the final interpreter of that statement. Probably no book ever published needed authoritative interpretation more than the Bible. We call it "the book of

[1] Art. XX.

peace"; it is in reality a book of war. No book has spread more discord than the Bible. Every sect in the world quotes the Bible as the source and justification of its existence. Men, equally learned, devout, prayerful, deduce the most opposite conclusions from the very same words. Two men, we will say, honestly and earnestly seek to know what the Bible teaches about Baptismal Regeneration, or the Blessed Sacrament. They have exactly the same *data* to go upon, precisely the same statements before them; yet, from the same premises, they will deduce a diametrically opposite conclusion. Hence, party wrangling, and sectarian bitterness; hence, the confusion of tongues, which has changed our Zion into Babel. Indeed, as we all know, so sharp was the contention in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, that translations of the Bible were actually forbidden by two local Church Councils.[1]

An interpreter is as much needed now, as in the days of the Ethiopian Eunuch. "*How* readest thou?"[2] is a question second only in import-

[1] The Council of Toulouse, 1229, and the Council of Trent, 1545-63.

[2] St. Luke x. 26.

ance (if, indeed, it is second) to "*What* is written?" Upon "how" we read, will very largely depend the value of "what" we read. We go, then, to the Church to interpret the book which it gave us.

And notice—to say this, is not to disparage the Scriptures because we exalt the Church. It is to put both Church and Scriptures in their true, historical place. We do not disparage a publication because we exalt the society which issues that publication; rather, we honour the one by exalting the other. Thus, when we say that the creeds interpret the Bible, we do not disparage the Bible because we exalt the creeds, any more than we disparage the Church when we say that the Bible proves the creeds. Take the "Virgin Birth," as a single illustration. Are we to believe that our Blessed Lord was "born of the Virgin Mary"? Church and Bible give the same reply. The Church taught it before the Bible recorded it; the Bible recorded it because the Church taught it. For us, as Churchmen, the matter is settled once and for all by the Apostles' Creed. Here we have the official and authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church, as proved by the New Testament: "born of the Virgin Mary".

It is this Bible, the Church's Manual of doctrine and devotion, that we are to think of.

We will think of it under five familiar names:—

(I) The Scriptures.

(II) The Bible.

(III) The Word of God.

(IV) Inspiration.

(V) Revelation.

(I) The Scriptures.

This was the earliest name by which the Bible was known—the name by which it was called for the first 1200 years in Church history. It was so named by the Latin Fathers in the fifth century, and it means, of course, "The Writings". These "Scriptures," or "Writings," were not, as the plural form of the word reminds us, one book, but many books, afterwards gathered into one book.[1] They were a library of separate books, called by St. Irenæus "The Divine Library"

[1] The first division of the Bible into *chapters* is attributed either to Cardinal Hugo, for convenience in compiling his Concordance of the Vulgate (about 1240), or to Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury (about 1228), to facilitate quotation. *Verses* were introduced into the New Testament by Robert Stephens, 1551. It is said that he did the work on a journey from Paris to Lyons.

—perhaps the best and most descriptive name the Bible ever had. This library consists of sixty-six books, not all written at one period, or for one age, but extending over a period of, at least, 1200 years.

The original copies of these writings, or Scriptures, have not yet been discovered, though we have extant three very early copies of them, written "by hand". These are known as the *Alexandrine* manuscript (or Codex), the *Vatican* manuscript, and the *Sinaitic* manuscript. Where may they be found?

One, dating from the latter part of the fourth, or the early part of the fifth century, is in the British Museum—a priceless treasure, which comparatively few have taken the trouble to go and see. It is known as the *Alexandrine* manuscript, and was presented to Charles I by the Patriarch of Constantinople in 1628. It consists of four volumes, three of which contain nearly all the Old Testament, and parts of the Apocrypha, and a fourth, containing a large part of the New Testament.

A second manuscript, dating from the fourth century, is in the Vatican Library in Rome, and is, therefore, known as the *Vatican* manuscript.

It contains nearly the whole of both the Old and New Testaments, and of the Apocrypha.

The third manuscript, dating also from the fourth century, is in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. It was discovered by Prof. Tischendorf, in 1859, in a basket of fragments, destined to be burned, in the Monastery of St. Catherine on *Mount Sinai;* hence it is called the *Sinaitic* manuscript.

These are the three earliest MS. collections of the Bible as yet discovered—and strange stories, of mystic beauty, and, it may be, of weird persecution, they could tell if only they could speak. Other manuscripts we have—copies of ancient manuscripts; versions of ancient manuscripts; translations of ancient manuscripts; texts of ancient manuscripts. So they come down the ages, till, at last, we reach our own "Revised Version," probably the most accurate and trustworthy version in existence.

"The Scriptures," or "the Writings," then, consist of many books, and in this very fact, they tell their own tale—the tale of diversity in unity. They were written for divers ages, divers intellects, divers nations, in divers languages, by divers authors or compilers. They were not all

written for the twentieth century, though they all have a message for the twentieth century; they were not all written for the English people, though they all have a truth for the English people; they were not all written by the same hand, though the same Hand guided all the writers. In, and through the Scriptures, "God, at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets"; and in, and through them, He "hath in these last days, spoken unto us by His Son".[1]

Time passes, and these sixty-six books, written at different periods, in different styles, in different dialects, are gathered together in one book, called "The Book," or The Bible.

(II) The Bible.

It was so named by the Greek Fathers in the thirteenth century, hundreds of years after its earliest name, "The Scriptures". The word is derived from the Greek *Biblia*, books, and originally meant the Egyptian *papyrus* (or *paper-reed*) from which paper was first made. A "bible," then, was originally any book made of paper, and

[1] Heb. i. 1, 2.

the name was afterwards given to the "Book of Books"— "*The Bible*".

Here, then, are sixty-six volumes bound together in one volume. This, too, tells its own tale. If "The Scriptures," or scattered writings, speak of diversity in unity, "The Bible," or collected writings, tells of unity in diversity. Each separate book has its own most sacred message, while one central, unifying thought dominates all—the Incarnate Son of God. The Old Testament writings foretell His coming ("They are they which testify of me"[1]); the New Testament writings proclaim His Advent ("The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us"[2]). Thus, all the books become one book.

Many the tongues,
The theme is one,
The glory of the Eternal Son.

Take away that central Figure, and both the background of the Old Testament and the foreground of the New become dull, sunless, colourless. Reinstate that central Figure, and book after book, roll after roll, volume after volume, becomes bright, sunny, intelligible.

This it is which separates the Bible from every other book; this it is which makes it the worthiest

[1] St. John v. 39. [2] St. John i. 14.

of all books for reverent, prayerful criticism ; this it is which makes its words nuggets of gold, "dearer unto me than thousands of gold and silver" ; this it is which gives the Bible its third name :—

(III) The Word of God.

In what sense is the Bible the Word of God? Almost any answer must hurt some, and almost every answer must disappoint others. For a time, the "old school" and the "new school" must bear with each other, neither counting itself "to have apprehended," but each pressing forward to attain results.

In speaking of the Bible, we commonly meet with two extreme classes : on the one hand, there are those who hold that every syllable is the Word of God, and therefore outside all criticism ; on the other hand, there are those who hold that the Bible is no more the "Word of God" than any other book, and may, therefore, be handled and criticized just like any other book. In between these two extremes, there is another class, which holds that the Bible is the Word of God, and that just because it is the Word of God, it is —above all other books—an "open Bible," a

book open for sacred study, devout debate, reverent criticism.

The first class holds that every one of the 925,877 words in the Bible is as literally "God's Word" as if no human hand had written it. Thus, Dean Burgon writes: "Every word of it, every chapter of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. . . . Every syllable is just what it would have been . . . *without the intervention of any human agent.*" This, of course, creates hopeless difficulties. For instance, in the Authorized Version (to take but one single version) there are obvious insertions, such as St. Mark xvi. 9-20, which may not be "the Word of God" at all. There are obvious misquotations, such as in the seven variations in St. Stephen's speech.[1] There are obvious doubts about accurate translations, where the marginal notes give alternative readings. There are obvious mistakes by modern printers, as there were by ancient copyists.[2] There are three versions of the Psalms now in use (the Authorized Version, the Revised Version, and the Prayer-Book Version), all differing

[1] Acts vii.

[2] The University Presses offer £1 1s. for every such hitherto undiscovered inaccuracy brought to their notice.

from each other. The translators of the Authorized Version wish, they say, to make "*one more exact* translation of the Scriptures," and one-third of the translators of the Revised Version constantly differs from the other two-thirds. Here, clearly, the human agent is at work.

Then there are those who, perhaps from a natural reaction, deny that any word in the Bible is in any special sense "the Word of God". But this, too, creates hopeless difficulties, and satisfies no serious student. If the Bible is, in no special sense, the Word of God, there is absolutely no satisfactory explanation of its unique position and career in history. It is a great fact which remains unaccounted for. Moreover, no evidence exists which suggests that the writers who call it the Word of God were either frauds or dupes, or that they were deceived when they proclaimed "*God* spake these words, and said"; or, "Thus saith *the Lord*"; or, "The Revelation of *Jesus Christ* by His servant John". There must, upon the lowest ground, be a sense in which it may be truly said that the Bible is the Word of God as no other book is. This we may consider under the fourth name, Inspiration.

(IV) Inspiration.

What do we mean by the word? The Church has nowhere defined it, and we are not tied to any one interpretation; but the Bible itself suggests a possible meaning.

It is the Word of God heard through the voice of man.

Think of some such expression as: "*The Revelation of Jesus Christ which He gave by His servant John*" (Rev. i. 1). Here two facts are stated: (1) The revelation is from Jesus Christ; (2) It was given through a human agent—John. God gave it; man conveyed it. Again: "*Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*" (2 Pet. i. 21). The Holy Ghost moved them; they spake: the speakers, not the writings, were inspired. Again: "*As He spake by the mouth of His holy Prophets*"[1] (St. Luke i. 70). He spake; but He spake through the mouthpiece of the human agent. And once again, as the Collect for the second Sunday in Advent tells us, it is the "*blessed Lord Who* (*hast*) *caused all Holy Scriptures to be written*". God was the initiating

[1] This is the Church's description of Inspiration in the Nicene Creed: "Who spake by the Prophets".

cause of writings: man was the inspired writer. Each messenger received the message, but each passed it on in his own way. It was with each as it was with Haggai: "Then spake Haggai, the *Lord's messenger* in the *Lord's message*" (Haggai i. 13). The message was Divine, though the messenger was human; the message was infallible, though the messenger was fallible; the vessel was earthen, though the contents were golden. In this unique sense, the Bible is indeed "the Word of God". It is the "Word of God," delivered in the words of man.

Thus, as Dr. Sanday puts it, the Bible is, at once, both human and Divine; not less Divine because thoroughly human, and not less human because essentially Divine. We need not necessarily parcel it out and say such and such things are human and such and such things are Divine, though there are instances in which we may do this, and the Scriptures would justify us in so doing. There will be much in Holy Scripture which is at once very human and very Divine. The two aspects are not incompatible with each other; rather, they are intimately united. Look at them in one light, and you will see the one; look at them in another light, and you will see

the other. But the substance of that which gives these different impressions is one and the same.

It is from no irreverence, but because of the over-towering importance of the book, that the best scholars (devout, prayerful scholars, as well as the reverse) have given the best of their lives to the study of its text, its history, its writers, its contents.

Their criticism has, as we know, been classified under three heads :—

(1) Lower, or *textual* criticism.

(2) Higher, or *documentary* criticism.

(3) Historical, or *contemporary* criticism.

Lower criticism seeks for, and studies, the best and purest text obtainable—the text nearest to the original, from which fresh translations can be made.

Higher criticism seeks for, and studies, documents : it deals with the authenticity of different books, the date at which they were written, the names of their authors.

Historical criticism seeks for, and studies, *data* relating to the history of the times when each book was written, and the light thrown upon that history by recent discoveries (e.g. in archæology, and excavations in Palestine).

No very definite results have yet been reached on many points of criticism, and, on many of them, scholars have had again and again to reverse their conclusions. We are still only *en route*, and are learning more and more to possess our souls in patience, and to wait awhile for anything in the nature of finality. Meanwhile, the living substance is unshaken and untouched.

This living substance, entrusted to living men, is the revelation of God to man, and leads us to our last selected name—Revelation.

(V) Revelation.

The Bible is the revelation of the Blessed Trinity to man—of God the Son, by God the Father, through God the Holy Ghost. It is the revelation of God to man, and in man. First, it reveals God *to* man—"pleased as Man with man to dwell". In it, God stands in front of man, and, through the God-Man, shows him what God is like. It reveals God as the "pattern on the mount," for man to copy on the plain. But it does more than this: it reveals God *in* man. So St. Paul writes: "It pleased God to reveal His Son *in* me";[1] and again, "God hath

[1] Gal. i. 15.

shined *in* our hearts".[1] The Bible reveals to me that Jesus, the revelation of the Father, through the Eternal Spirit, dwells in me, as well as outside me. He is a power within, as well as a pattern without.

Yet again. The Bible reveals God's purpose *for* man. There is no such other revelation of that purpose. You cannot deduce God's purpose either in man's life, or in his twentieth century environment. It can only be fully deduced from Revelation. Man may seem temporarily to defeat God's purpose, to postpone its accomplishment; but Revelation (and nothing but Revelation) proclaims that "the Word of the Lord standeth sure," and that God's primal purpose is God's final purpose.

Lastly, the Bible is the revelation of a future state. Things begun here will be completed there. As such, it gives man a hope on which to build a belief, and a belief on which to found a hope.

> We must believe,
> For still we hope
> That, in a world of larger scope,
> What here is faithfully begun
> Will be completed, not undone.

[1] 2 Cor. iv. 6.

Thus, we may, perhaps, find in these five familiar names, brief headings for leisure thoughts. In them, we see the *Scriptures*, or many books, gathered together into one book called *The Book.* In this book, we see the *Word of God* delivered to men by men, and these men *inspired* by God to be the living *media* of the *Revelation* of God to man.

Our next selected book will be the Church of England Prayer Book.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH'S BOOKS.

(2) The Prayer Book.

We now come to the second of the Church's books selected for discussion—the Prayer Book.

The English Prayer Book is the local presentment of the Church's Liturgies for the English people.

Each part of the Church has its own Liturgy, differing in detail, language, form; but all teaching the same faith, all based upon the same rule laid down by Gregory for Augustine's guidance.[1] Thus, there is the Liturgy of St. James, the Liturgy of St. John,[2] the Liturgy of St. Mark, and others. A National Church is within her rights when she compiles a Liturgy for National Use, provided that it is in harmony with the basic Liturgies of the Undivided Church. She has

[1] See p. 13.

[2] Possibly, the origin of the British Liturgy revised by St. Augustine, and of the present Liturgy of the English Church.

as much right to her local "Use," with its rules and ritual, as a local post office has to its own local regulations, provided it does not infringe any universal rule of the General Post Office. For example, a National Church has a perfect right to say in what language her Liturgy shall be used. When the English Prayer Book orders her Liturgy to be said in "the vulgar,"[1] or common, "tongue" of the people, she is not infringing, but exercising a local right which belongs to her as part of the Church Universal. This is what the English Church has done in the English Prayer Book.

It is this Prayer Book that we are now to consider.

We will try to review, or get a bird's-eye view of it as a whole, rather than attempt to go into detail. And, as the best reviewer is the one who lets a book tell its own story, and reads the author's meaning out of it rather than his own theories into it, we will let the book, as far as possible, speak for itself.

Now, in reviewing a book, the reviewer will probably look at three things: the title, the preface, the contents.

[1] From *vulgus*, a crowd.

(I) The Title.

"*The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England.*"

Here are three clear statements: (1) it is "The Book of Common Prayer"; (2) it is the local "directory" for the "*Administration* of the Sacraments of the Church," i.e. of the Universal Church; (3) this directory is called the "Use of the Church of England". Think of each statement in turn.

(1) *It is "The Book of Common Prayer".*— "Common Prayer"[1] was the name given to public worship in the middle of the sixteenth century. The Book of Common Prayer is the volume in which the various services were gathered together for common use. It is many books in one book. As the Bible is one book made up of sixty-six books, so the Prayer Book is one book made up of six books. These books, revised and abbreviated for English "Use," were:—

[1] Cf. Acts iv. 24, "They lifted up their voices *with one accord*".

(1) The Pontifical.
(2) The Missal.
(3) The Gospels.
(4) The Gradual.
(5) The Breviary.
(6) The Manual.

Before the invention of printing, these books were written in manuscript, and were too heavy to carry about bound together in one volume. Each, therefore, was carried by the user separately. Thus, when the Bishop, or *Pontifex*, was ordaining or confirming, he carried with him a separate book containing the offices for Ordination and Confirmation; and, because it contained the offices used by the Bishop, or *Pontiff*, it was called the *Pontifical.* When a priest wished to celebrate the Holy Eucharist, he used a separate book called "The Missal" (from the Latin *Missa*, a Mass[1]). When, in the Eucharist, the deacon read the Gospel for the day, he read it from a separate book called "The Gospels". When he

[1] The word *Mass*, which has caused such storms of controversy, originally meant a *dismissal* of the congregation. It is found in words such as Christ-mas (i.e. a short name for the Eucharist on the Feast of the Nativity), Candle-mas, Martin-mas, Michael-mas, and so on.

went in procession to read it, the choir sang scriptural phrases out of a separate book called "The Gradual" (from the Latin *gradus*, a step), because they were sung *in gradibus*, i.e. upon the steps of the pulpit, or rood-loft, from which the Gospel was read. When the clergy said their offices at certain fixed "Hours," they used a separate book called "The Breviary" (from the Latin *brevis*, short), because it contained the brief, or short, writings which constituted the office, out of which our English Matins and Evensong were practically formed. When services for such as needed Baptism, Matrimony, Unction, Burial, were required, some light book that could easily be carried *in the hand* was used, and this was called "The Manual" (from the Latin *manus*, a hand).

These six books, written in Latin, were, in 1549, shortened, and, with various alterations, translated into English, bound in one volume, which is called "The Book of Common Prayer".

Alterations, some good and some bad, have from time to time been adopted, and revisions made; but the Prayer Book is now the same in substance as it always has been—a faithful reproduction, in all essentials, of the worship and teach-

ing of the Undivided Church. As we all know, a further revision is now contemplated. All agree that it is needed; all would like to amend the Prayer Book in one direction or another; but there is a sharp contention as to whether this is the time for revision, and what line the revision should take. The nature of the last attempted revision, in the reign of William III,[1] will make the liturgical student profoundly grateful that that proposed revision was rejected, and will suggest infinite caution before entrusting a new revision to any but proved experts, and liturgical specialists.[2]

Whatever changes are made, they should, at least, be based on two principles—permanence and progress. The essence of progress is loyalty to the past. Nothing should be touched that is a permanent part of the Ancient Office Books; nothing should be omitted, or added, that is outside the teaching of the Universal Church. For the immediate present, we would ask that the

[1] This was published *in extenso* in a Blue Book, issued by the Government on 2 June, 1854.

[2] It is difficult to see how any revision could obtain legal sanction, even if prepared by Convocation, save by an Act of Parliament after free discussion by the present House of Commons.

Prayer Book should be left untouched, but that an Appendix, consisting of many unauthorized services now in use, should be "put forth by authority," i.e. by the sanction of the Bishops.

(2) *The Administration of the Sacraments of the Church.*—The Sacraments are the treasures of the *whole* Church; the way in which they may be "administered" is left to the decision of that part of the Church in which they are administered. Take, once again, the question of language. One part of the Church has as much right to administer the Sacraments in English as another part has to administer them in Latin, or another part in Greek. For instance, the words, "This is My Body" in the English Liturgy are quite as near to the original as "*Hoc est Corpus Meum*" is in the Latin Liturgy. Each Church has a right to make its own regulations for its own people.

So with "rites and ceremonies". Provided the essence of the Sacrament is not touched, the addition or omission of particular rites and ceremonies does not affect the validity of the Sacrament. For, the title of the Prayer Book carefully distinguishes between "The Church" and "The Church of England," "the *Sacraments*" and the "*administration* of the Sacraments". It is for

administrative purposes that there is an English "Use," i.e. an English method of administering the Sacraments of the Universal Church. It is this use which the title-page calls :—

(3) *The Use of the Church of England.*— This "Use" may vary at different times, and even in different dioceses. We read of one "Use" in the Diocese of York; another in the Diocese of Sarum, or Salisbury; another in the Diocese of Hereford; another in the Diocese of Bangor; and so on. Indeed, there were so many different Uses at one time that, for the sake of unity, one Use was substituted for many; and that Use, sufficient in all essentials, is found in our "Book of Common Prayer".

(II) The Preface.

It was written, in 1661, by Bishop Sanderson, and amended by the Upper House of Convocation.

What, we ask, do these preface-writers say about the book to which they gave their *imprimatur?*

First, they state their position. They have no intention whatever of writing a new book. Their aim is to adapt old books to new needs.

Adaptation, not invention, is their aim. Four times in their short Preface they refer us to "the ancient Fathers" as their guides.

Next, they state their object. Two dangers, they tell us, have to be avoided. In compiling a Liturgy from Ancient Sources, one danger will be that of "too much stiffness in *refusing*" new matter—i.e. letting a love of permanence spoil progress: another, and opposite danger, will be "too much easiness in *admitting*" any variation—i.e. letting a love of progress spoil permanence. They will try to avoid both dangers. "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England to keep the mean between the two extremes," when either extreme runs away from the "faith once delivered to the Saints".

Another object they had in view was to give a prominent place to Holy Scripture. "So that here," they say, "you have an Order for Prayer, and for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of *the old Fathers*."

Next, they deal with the principles which underlie all ritualism. In speaking "of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some re-

tained," they lay it down that, "although the keeping or admitting of a Ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing, yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a Common Order and discipline is no small offence before God". Then, in a golden sentence, they add: "Whereas the minds of men are so diverse that some think it a great matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their ceremonies, they be so addicted to their old customs; and, again, on the other side, some be so new-fangled that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old, that nothing can like them, but that is new: it was thought expedient, not so much to have respect how to please and satisfy either of these parties, as *how to please God*, and profit them both".

Finally, whilst wishing to ease men from the oppressive burden of a multitude of ceremonies, "whereof St. Augustine, in his time, complained," they assert the right of each Church to make its own ritual-rules (in conformity with the rules of the whole Church), provided that it imposes them on no one else. "And in these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only; for we think it con-

venient that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best."

It is necessary to call attention to all this, because few Church people seem to know anything about the intentions, objects, and principles of the compilers, as stated by themselves in the Prayer Book Preface.

(III) The Contents.

These a reviewer might briefly deal with under three heads—Doctrine, Discipline, and Devotion.

Doctrine.

The importance of this cannot be exaggerated. The English Prayer Book is, for the ordinary Churchman, a standard of authority when theological doctors differ. The *Prayer Book* is the Court of Appeal from the pulpit—just as the Undivided Church is the final Court of Appeal from the Prayer Book. Many a man is honestly puzzled and worried at the charge so frequently levelled at the Church of England, that one preacher flatly contradicts another, and that what is taught as truth in one church is denied as heresy in another. This is, of course, by no

means peculiar to the Church of England, but it is none the less a loss to the unity of Christendom.

The whole mischief arises from treating the individual preacher as if he were the Book of Common Prayer. It is to the Prayer Book, not to the Pulpit, that we must go to prove what is taught. For instance, I go into one church, and I hear one preacher deny the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; I go into another, and I hear the same doctrine taught as the very essence of The Faith. I ask, in despair, what does the Church of England teach? which teacher am I to believe? What is the answer? It is this. I am not bound to believe either teacher, until I have tested his utterances by some authorized book. This book is the Prayer Book. What does the Church of England Prayer Book—not this or that preacher—say is the teaching of the Church of England? In the case quoted, this is the Prayer Book answer: "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that *this child is regenerate*".[1] Here is something clear, crisp, definite. It is the authorized expression of the belief of the Church of England in common with the whole Catholic Church.

[1] Public Baptism of Infants.

Or, I hear two sermons on conversion. In one, conversion is almost sneered at, or, at least, apologized for ; in another, it is taught with all the fervour of a personal experience. What am I to believe? What does the Church of England teach about it? What does the Prayer Book say? Open it at the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, or at the third Collect for Good Friday, and you will hear a trumpet which gives no uncertain sound.

Or, I am wondering and worried about Confession and Absolution. What does the Church of England teach about them? One preacher says one thing, one another. But what is the Church of England's authoritative utterance on the subject? Open your Prayer Book, and you will see: you will find that, with the rest of the Christian Church, she provides for both, in public and in private, for the strong, and for the sick.

This, at least, is the view an honest onlooker will take of our position. A common-sense Nonconformist minister, wishing to teach his people and to get at facts, studies the English Prayer Book. This is his conclusion: "Free Churchmen," he writes, "dissent from much of the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. In

the service of Baptism, expressions are used which naturally lead persons to regard it as a means of salvation. God is asked to 'sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin'. After Baptism, God is thanked for having 'regenerated the child with His Holy Spirit'. It is called the 'laver of regeneration,' by which the child, being born in sin, is received into the number of God's children. In the Catechism, the child is taught to say of Baptism, 'wherein I was made a child of God'. It is said to be 'generally necessary to salvation,' and the rubric declares that children who are baptized, and die before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved'."[1] What could be a fairer statement of the Prayer-Book teaching? And he goes on: "In the visitation of the sick, if the sick person makes a confession of his sins, and 'if he heartily and humbly desire it,' the Priest is bidden to absolve him. The form of Absolution is '. . . I absolve thee from all thy sins in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'. In the Ordination Service, the Bishop confers the power of Absolution upon the Priest." Nothing could be fairer. It is precisely what the Church

[1] "The Folkestone Baptist," June, 1899.

of England *does* teach in her authorized formularies which Archbishop Cranmer gathered together from the old Service-books of the ancient Church of England.

The pulpit passes: the Prayer Book remains.

Discipline.

The Prayer Book deals with principles, rather than with details—though details have their place. It is a book of discipline, "as well for the body as the soul". It disciplines the body for the sake of the soul; it disciplines the soul for the sake of the body. Now it tightens, now it relaxes, the human bow. For example, in the *Table of Feasts and Fasts*, it lays down one principle which underlies all bodily and spiritual discipline—the need of training to obtain self-control. The *principle* laid down is that I am to discipline myself at stated times and seasons, in order that I may not be undisciplined at any times or seasons. I am to rejoice as a duty on certain days, that I may live in the joy of the Redeemed on other days. Feasts and Fasts have a meaning, and I cannot deliberately ignore the Prayer-Book Table without suffering loss.

It is the same with the rubrical directions as to

ritual. I am ordered to stand when praising, to kneel when praying. The underlying *principle* is that I am not to do things in my own way, without regard to others, but to do them in an orderly way, and as one of many. I am learning to sink the individual in the society. So with the directions as to vestments—whether they are the Eucharistic vestments, ordered by the "Ornaments Rubric," or the preacher's Geneva gown not ordered anywhere. The *principle* laid down is, special things for special occasions; all else is a matter of degree. One form of Ceremonial will appeal to one temperament, a different form to another. "I like a grand Ceremonial," writes Dr. Bright, "and I own that Lights and Vestments give me real pleasure. But then I should be absurd if I expected that everybody else, who had the same faith as myself, should necessarily have the same feeling as to the form of its expression."[1] From the subjective and disciplinary point of view, the mark of the Cross must be stamped on many of our own likes and dislikes, both in going without, and in bearing with, ceremonial, especially in small towns and villages where there is only one church. The principle

[1] "Letters and Memoirs of William Bright," p. 143.

which says, "You shan't have it because I don't like it," or, "You shall have it because I do like it," leads to all sorts of confusion. As Dr. Liddon says: "When men know what the revelation of God in His Blessed Son really is, all else follows in due time—reverence on one side and charity on the other".[1]

Devotion.

Reading the Prayer Book as it stands, from Matins to the Consecration of an Archbishop, no reviewer could miss its devotional beauty. It is, perhaps, a misfortune that the most beautiful Office of the Christian Church, the Eucharistic Office, should come in the middle, instead of at the beginning, of our Prayer Book, first in order as first in importance. Its character, though capable of much enrichment, reminds us of how much devotional beauty the Prayer Book has from ancient sources. In our jealous zeal for more beauty we are, perhaps, apt to underrate much that we already possess. God won't give us more than we have until we have learnt to value that which we possess.

It is impossible, in the time that remains, to

[1] "Life and Letters of H. P. Liddon," p. 329.

do more than emphasize one special form of beauty in "The Book of Common Prayer"—The Collects. The Prayer-Book Collects are pictures of beauty. Only compare a modern collect with the Prayer-Book Collects, and you will see the difference without much looking.

Learn to value the Prayer Book. From birth to death it provides, as we shall see, special offices, and special prayers for the main events of our lives, though many minor events are still unprovided for.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHURCH'S SACRAMENTS.

We have seen that a National Church is the means whereby the Catholic Church reaches the nation; that her function is (1) to teach, and (2) to feed the nation; that she teaches through her books, and feeds through her Sacraments.

We now come to the second of these two functions—the spiritual feeding of the nation. This she does through the Sacraments—a word which comes from the Latin *sacrare* (from *sacer*), sacred.[1] The Sacraments are the sacred *media* through which the soul of man is fed with the grace of God.

[1] St. Leo defines a Sacrament thus: "*Sacramentum.* (1) It originally signified the pledge or deposit in money which in certain suits according to Roman Law plaintiff and defendant were alike bound to make; (2) it came to signify a pledge of military fidelity, a *voluntary* oath; (3) then the *exacted* oath of allegiance; (4) any oath whatever; (5) in early Christian use any sacred or solemn act, and especially any mystery where more was meant than met the ear or eye" (Bright's "Select Sermons of St. Leo on the Incarnation," p. 136).

We may think of them under three heads :— their number ; their nature ; their names.

(I) The Number of the Sacraments.

In the early Church the number was unlimited. After the twelfth century, the number was technically limited to seven. Partly owing to the mystic number seven,[1] and partly because seven seemed to meet the needs of all sorts and conditions of men, the septenary number of Sacraments became either fixed or special. The Latin Church taught that there were "seven, and seven only" : the Greek Church specialized seven, without limiting their number : the English Church picked out seven, specializing two as "generally necessary to salvation"[2] and five (such as Confirmation and Marriage) as "commonly called Sacraments".[3]

The English Church, then, teaches that, without arbitrarily limiting their number, there are seven special means of grace, either "generally necessary" for all, or specially provided for some. And, as amongst her books she selects two, and calls them "*The* Bible," and "*The* Prayer

[1] Symbolical of completion. [2] Church Catechism.
[3] Article XXV.

Book," so amongst her Sacraments she deliberately marks out two for a primacy of honour.

These two are so supreme, as being "ordained by Christ Himself"; so pre-eminent, as flowing directly from the Wounded Side, that she calls them "the Sacraments of the Gospel". They are, above all other Sacraments, "glad tidings of great joy" to every human being. And these two are "generally necessary," i.e. necessary for all alike—they are *generaliter*, i.e. for *all* and not only for *special* states (such as Holy Orders): they are "for *every* man in his vocation and ministry". The other five are not necessarily essential for all. They have not all "the like nature of Sacraments of the Gospel," in that they were not all "ordained by Christ Himself". It is the nature of the two Sacraments of the Gospel that we now consider.

(II) The Nature of the Sacraments.

"What meanest thou by this word, Sacrament?" The Catechism, confining its answer to the two greater Sacraments, replies: "I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace . . ."[1]

[1] The answer is borrowed from Peter Lombard (a pupil of Abelard and Professor of Theology, and for a short time

Putting this into more modern language, we might say that a Sacrament is a supernatural conjunction of spirit and matter.[1] It is not matter only ; it is not spirit only ; it is not matter opposed to spirit, but matter of which spirit is the expression, and "the ultimate reality". Thus, for a perfect Sacrament, there must be both "the outward and visible" (matter), and "the inward and spiritual" (spirit). It is the conjunction of the two which makes the Sacrament. Thus, a Sacrament is not wholly under the conditions of material laws, nor is it wholly under the conditions of spiritual laws ; it is under the conditions of what (for lack of any other name) we call *Sacramental* laws. As yet, we know comparatively little of either material or spiritual laws, and we cannot be surprised that we know still less of Sacramental laws. We are in the student stage, and are perpetually revising our conclusions.

Bishop of Paris), who defines a Sacrament as a "visible sign of an invisible grace," probably himself borrowing the thought from St. Augustine.

[1] Dr. Illingworth calls "the material order another aspect of the spiritual, which is gradually revealing itself through material concealment, in the greater and lesser Christian Sacraments, which radiate from the Incarnation" ("Sermons Preached in a College Chapel," p. 173).

In all three cases, we very largely "walk by faith".

But this at least we may say of Sacraments. Matter without spirit cannot effect that which matter with spirit can, and does, effect. As in the Incarnation, God[1] expresses Himself through matter[2]— so it is in the Sacraments. In Baptism, the Holy Spirit "expresses Himself" through water: in the Eucharist, through bread and wine. In each case, the perfect integrity of matter and of spirit are essential to the validity of the Sacrament. In each case, it is the conjunction of the two which guarantees the full effect of either.[3]

(III) The Names of the Sacraments.

As given in the Prayer Book, these are seven —"Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord," Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Unction.

We will think now of the two first.

[1] God is *Spirit*, St. John IV. 24.

[2] The Word was made *Flesh*, St. John I. 14.

[3] The water in Baptism is not, of course, *consecrated* as the bread and wine are in the Eucharist. It does not, like the bread and wine, "become what it was not, without ceasing to be what it was," but it is "*sanctified* to the mystical washing away of sins".

CHAPTER V.

BAPTISM.

CONSIDER, What it is;
What it does;
How it does it.

(I) WHAT IT IS.

The Sacrament of Baptism is the supernatural conjunction of matter and spirit—of water and the Holy Ghost. Water must be there, and spirit must be there. It is by the conjunction of the two that the Baptized is "born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost".

So the Prayer Book teaches. At the reception of a privately baptized child into the Church, it is laid down that "matter" and "words" are the two essentials for a valid Baptism.[1] "Because some things essential to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted (and thus invalidate the Sacrament), . . . I demand," says the priest,

[1] See Service for the "Private Baptism of Children".

"with what matter was this child baptized?" and "with what words was this child baptized?" And because the omission of right matter or right words would invalidate the Sacrament, further inquiry is made, and the god-parents are asked: "by whom was this child baptized?": "who was present when this child was baptized?" Additional security is taken, if there is the slightest reason to question the evidence given. The child is then given "Conditional Baptism," and Baptism is administered with the conditional words: "If thou art not already baptized,"—for Baptism cannot be repeated—"I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." So careful is the Church both in administering and guarding the essentials of the Sacrament.

And notice: nothing but the water and the words are *essential.* Other things may, or may not, be edifying; they are not essential; they are matters of ecclesiastical regulation, not of Divine appointment. Thus, a *Priest* is not essential to a valid Baptism, as he is for a valid Eucharist. A Priest is the normal, but not the necessary, instrument of Baptism. "In the absence of a

Priest"[1] a Deacon may baptize, and if the child is *in extremis*, any one, of either sex, may baptize.

Again, *Sponsors* are not essential to the validity of the Sacrament. Sponsors are safeguards, not essentials. They are only a part—an invaluable part—of ecclesiastical regulation. When, in times of persecution, parents might be put to death, other parents were chosen as parents-in-God (God-parents)[2] to safeguard the child's Christian career. Sponsors are "sureties" of the Church, not parts of the Sacraments. They stand at the font, as fully admitted Church members, to welcome a new member into the Brotherhood. But a private Baptism without Sponsors would be a valid Baptism.

So, too, in regard to *Ceremonial*. The mode of administering the Sacrament may vary: it is not (apart from the matter and words) of the essence of the Sacrament. There are, in fact, three ways in which Baptism may be validly administered. It may be administered by *Immersion*, *Aspersion*, or *Affusion*.

Immersion (*in-mergere*, to dip into) is the original and primitive form of administration.

[1] Service for the Ordination of Deacons.

[2] From an old word, Gossip or *Godsib*, i.e. God relation.

As the word suggests, it consists of dipping the candidate into the water—river, bath, or font.

Aspersion (*ad spargere*, to sprinkle upon) is not a primitive form of administration. It consists in sprinkling water upon the candidate's forehead.

Affusion (*ad fundere*, to pour upon) is the allowed alternative to Immersion. It consists in pouring water upon the candidate.

All these methods are valid. Immersion was the Apostolic method, and explains most vividly the Apostolic teaching (in which the Candidate is "buried with Christ" by immersion, and rises again by emersion)[1] no less than the meaning of the word—from the Greek *baptizo*, to dip. Provision for Immersion has been made by a Font-grave, in Lambeth Parish Church, erected in memory of Archbishop Benson, and constantly made use of. But, even in Apostolic times, Baptism by "Affusion" was allowed to the sick, and was equally valid. In the Prayer Book, affusion is either permitted (as in the Public Baptism of infants), or ordered (as in the Private Baptism of infants), or, again, allowed (as in the Baptism of those of riper years). It will be

[1] Cf. Rom. vi. 4; Eph. v. 26.

noted that the Church of England makes no allusion to "Aspersion," or the "sprinkling" form of administration. The child or adult is always either to be dipped into the water, or to have water poured upon it.[1] Other ceremonies there are—ancient and mediæval. Some are full of beauty, but none are essential. Thus, in the first Prayer Book of 1549, a white vesture, called the *Chrisome*[2] or *Chrism*, was put upon the candidate, the Priest saying: "Take this white vesture for a token of innocency which, by God's grace, in the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, is given unto thee". It typified the white life to which the one anointed with the Chrisma, or symbolical oil, was dedicated.[3]

[1] *Trine Immersion*, i.e. dipping the candidate thrice, or thrice pouring water upon him, dates from the earliest ages, but exceptional cases have occurred where a single immersion has been held valid.

[2] From *Chrisma*, sacred oil—first the oil with which a child was anointed at Baptism, and then the robe with which the child was covered after Baptism and Unction, and hence the child itself was called a *Chrisome-child*, i.e. a child wearing the Chrisome robe.

[3] In the 1549 Prayer Book, the Prayer at the Anointing in the Baptismal Service ran: "Almighty God, Who hath regenerated thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath given unto thee the remission of all thy sins, He vouchsafe to

Another ancient custom was to give the newly baptized *milk and honey*. So, St. Clement of Alexandria writes: "As soon as we are born again, we become entitled to the hope of rest, the promise of Jerusalem which is above, where it is said to rain milk and honey".

Consignation, again, or the "signing with the sign of the cross," dates from a very early period.[1] It marks the child as belonging to the Good Shepherd, even as a lamb is marked with the owner's mark or sign.

Giving salt as a symbol of wisdom (*sal sapientiæ*); placing a lighted taper in the child's hand, typifying the illuminating Spirit; turning to the west to renounce the enemy of the Faith, and then to the east to recite our belief in that Faith; striking three blows with the hand, symbolical of fighting against the world, the flesh, and the devil: all such ceremonies, and many more, have their due place, and mystic meaning: but they are not part of the Sacrament. They are,

anoint thee with the Unction of His Holy Spirit, and bring thee to the inheritance of everlasting life. *Amen.*"

[1] St. Jerome, writing in the second century, says of the Baptized, that he "bore on his forehead the banner of the Cross".

as it were, scenery, beautiful scenery, round the Sacrament; frescoes on the walls; the "beauty of holiness"; "lily-work upon the top of the pillars";[1] the handmaids of the Sacrament, but not essential to the Sacrament. To deny that the Church of England rightly and duly administers the Sacrament because she omits any one of these ceremonies, is to confuse the picture with the frame, the jewel with its setting, the beautiful with the essential.[2]

We may deplore the loss of this or that Ceremony, but a National Church exercises her undoubted right in saying at any particular period of her history how the Sacrament is to be administered, provided the essentials of the Sacrament are left untouched. The Church Universal decides, once for all, what is essential:

[1] Lev. xiii.

[2] It is a real loss to use the Service for the Public Baptism of Infants as a private office, as is generally done now. The doctrinal teaching; the naming of the child; the signing with the cross; the response of, and the address to, the God-parents—all these would be helpful reminders to a congregation, if the service sometimes came, as the Rubric orders, after the second lesson, and might rekindle the Baptismal and Confirmation fire once lighted, but so often allowed to die down, or flicker out.

the National Church decides how best to secure and safeguard these essentials for her own *Use*.

(II) What it does.

According to the Scriptures, "*Baptism doth now save us*".[1] As God did "save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water," so does God save the human family from perishing by sin. As Noah and his family could, by an act of free will, have opened a window in the Ark, and have leapt into the waters, and frustrated God's purpose after they had been saved, so can any member of the human family, after it has been taken into the "Ark of Christ's Church," frustrate God's "good will towards" it, and wilfully leap out of its saving shelter. Baptism is "a beginning," not an end.[2] It puts us into a state of Salvation. It starts us in the way of Salvation. St. Cyprian says that in Baptism "we start crowned," and St. John says: "Hold fast that which thou hast that no man take thy crown".[3] Baptism is the Sacrament of initiation, not of finality. Directly the child is baptized, we pray that he "may lead the rest of his life according

[1] 1 Pet. III. 21. [2] Baptismal Service.
[3] Rev. III. 11.

to *this beginning*," and we heartily thank God for having, in Baptism, called us into a state of Salvation. In this sense, "Baptism doth save us".

But what does it save us from? Sin. In the Nicene Creed we say: "I believe in one Baptism for the remission of *sins*". Baptism saves us from our sins.

In the case of infants, Baptism saves from original, or inherited, sin—the sin whose origin can be traced to the Fall. In the case of adults, Baptism saves from both original and actual sin, both birth sin and life sin.

The Prayer Book is as explicit as the Bible on this point. In the case of infants, we pray: "We call upon Thee for this infant, that he, *coming to Thy Holy Baptism*, may receive remission of his sins"—before, i.e., the child has, by free will choice, committed actual sin. In the case of adults, we read: "Well-beloved, who are come hither desiring *to receive Holy Baptism*, ye have heard how the congregation hath prayed, that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to . . . *release you of your sins*". And, again, dealing with infants, the Rubric at the end of the "Public Baptism of Infants" declares that "It is certain, by God's Word, that children *who are*

baptized, dying before they commit *actual* sin, are undoubtedly saved".

In affirming this, the Church does not condemn all the unbaptized, infants or adults, to everlasting perdition, as the teaching of some is. Every affirmation does not necessarily involve its opposite negation. It was thousands of years before any souls at all were baptized on earth, and even now, few[1] in comparison with the total population of the civilized and uncivilized world, have been baptized. The Church nowhere assumes the self-imposed burden of legislation for these, or limits their chance of salvation to the Church Militant. What she does do, is to proclaim her unswerving belief in "one Baptism for the remission of sins"; and her unfailing faith in God's promises to those who *are* baptized—"which promise, He, for His part, will most surely keep and perform". On this point, she speaks with nothing short of "undoubted certainty"; on the other point, she is silent. She does not condemn an infant because no responsible person has brought it to Baptism, though she does condemn the person for not bringing it. She does not limit

[1] Not more, it is estimated, than two or three out of every eight have been baptized.

the power of grace to souls in this life only, but she does offer grace in this world, which may land the soul safely in the world to come.

One other thing Baptism does. Making the child a member of Christ, it gives it a "Christ-ian" name.

The Christian Name.

This Christian, or fore-name as it was called, is the real name. It antedates the surname by many centuries, surnames being unknown in England before the Norman invasion. The Christian name is the Christ-name. It cannot, by any known legal method, be changed. Surnames may be changed in various legal ways: not so the Christian name.[1] This was more apparent when the baptized were given only one Christian name, for it was not until the eighteenth century that a second or third name was added, and then only on grounds of convenience.

Again, according to the law of England, the only legal way in which a Christian name can be given, is by Baptism. Thus, if a child has been registered in one name, and is afterwards baptized

[1] I may take an *additional* Christian name at my Confirmation, but I cannot change the old one.

in another, the Baptismal, and not the registered, name is its legal name, even if the registered name was given first.

It is strange that, in view of all this, peers should drop their Christian names, i.e. their real names, their Baptismal names. The custom, apparently, dates only from the Stuart period, and is not easy to account for. It would seem to suggest a distinct loss. The same loss, if it be a loss, is incurred by the Town Clerk of London, who omits his Christian name in signing official documents.[1] The King, more happily, retains his Baptismal or Christian name, and has no surname.[2] Bishops sign themselves by both their

[1] The present Town Clerk of London has kindly informed me that the earliest example he has found dates from 1418, when the name of John Carpenter, Town Clerk, the well-known executor of Whittington, is appended to a document, the Christian name being omitted.

[2] The following letter from Mr. Ambrose Lee of the Heralds' College may interest some. ". . . Surname, in the ordinary sense of the word, the King has none. He—as was his grandmother, Queen Victoria, as well as her husband, Prince Albert—is descended from Witikind, who was the last of a long line of continental Saxon kings or rulers. Witikind was defeated by Charlemagne, became a Christian, and was created Duke of Saxony. He had a second son, who was Count of Wettin, but clear and well-defined and

Christian and official name, as "Randall Cantuar; Cosmo Ebor.; A. F. Londin; H. E. Winton; F. Oxon.".

We may consider three words, both helps and puzzles, used in connexion with Holy Baptism: *Regeneration*, *Adoption*, *Election*. Each has its own separate teaching, though there are points at which their meanings run into each other.

Regeneration.

"We yield Thee hearty thanks that it hath pleased Thee to *regenerate* this infant." So runs the Prayer-Book thanksgiving after baptism. What does it mean? The word regeneration comes from two Latin words, *re*, again, *generare*, to generate, and means exactly what it says. In Prayer-Book language, it means being "*born again*". And, notice, it refers to infants as well

authenticated genealogies do not exist from which may be formulated any theory establishing, by right or custom, *any* surname, in the ordinary accepted sense of the word, for the various families who are descended in the male line from this Count of Wettin. . . . And, by-the-by, it must not be forgotten that the earliest Guelphs were merely princes whose baptismal name was Guelph, as the baptismal name of our Hanoverian Kings was George."

as to adults. The new birth is as independent of the child's choice as the natural birth.

And this is just what we should expect from a God of love. The child is not consulted about his first birth, neither is he consulted about his second birth. He does not wait (as the Baptists teach) until he is old enough to make a free choice of second birth, but as soon as he is born into the world ("within seven or fourteen days," the Prayer Book orders) he is reborn into the Church. Grace does not let nature get ten to twenty years' start, but gives the soul a fair chance from the very first: and so, and only so, is a God of love "justified in His saying, and clear when He is judged".

Adoption.

But there is a second word. The Baptismal Thanksgiving calls the Baptized "God's own child by Adoption". A simple illustration will best explain the word. When a man is "naturalized," he speaks of his new country as the land of his *adoption.* If a Frenchman becomes a naturalized Englishman, he ceases legally to be a Frenchman; ceases to be under French law; ceases to serve in the French army. He be-

comes legally an Englishman; he is under English law; serves in the English army; has all the privileges and obligations of a "new-born" Englishman. He may turn out to be a bad Englishman, a traitor to his adopted country; he may even hanker after his old life as a Frenchman—but he has left one kingdom for another, and, good, bad, or indifferent, he is a subject of his new King; he is a son of his adopted country. He cannot belong to two kingdoms, serve under two kings, live under two sets of laws, at the same time.

It is so with the Baptized. He has been "adopted" into a new kingdom. He is a subject of "the Kingdom of Heaven". But he cannot belong to two kingdoms at the same time. His "death unto sin" involves a "new birth (regeneration) unto righteousness". He ceases to be a member of the old kingdom, to serve under the sway of the old king, to be a "child of wrath". He renounces all allegiance to Satan; he becomes God's own child by "adoption". He may be a good, bad, or indifferent child; he may be a lost child, but he does not cease to be God's child. Rather, it is just because he is still God's child that there is hope for him. It is because he is

the child of God by adoption that the "spirit of adoption" within him can still cry, "Abba, Father," that he can still claim the privilege of his adopted country, and "pardon through the Precious Blood". True, he has obligations and responsibilities, as well as privileges, and these we shall see under the next word, Election.

Election.

The Catechism calls the Baptized "the elect people of God," and the Baptismal Service asks that the child may by Baptism be "taken into the number of God's elect children". What does it mean? The word itself comes from two Latin words, *e*, or *ex*, out; and *lego*, to choose. The "elect," then, are those chosen out from others. It sounds like favouritism; it reads like "privileged classes"—and so it is. But the privilege of election is the privilege of service. It is like the privilege of a Member of Parliament, the favoured candidate—the privilege of being elected to serve others. Every election is for the sake of somebody else. The Member of Parliament is elected for the sake of his constituents; the Town Councillor is elected for the sake of his fellow-townsmen; the Governor is elected for the sake of the

governed. It is so with spiritual elections. The Jews were "elect"; but it was for the sake of the Gentiles—"that the Gentiles, through them, might be brought in". The Blessed Virgin was "elect"; but it was that "all generations might call her blessed". The Church is "elect," but it is for the sake of the world,—that it, too, might be "brought in". No election ends with itself. The Baptized are "elect," but not for their own sakes; not to be a privileged class, save to enjoy the privilege of bringing others in. They are "chosen out" of the world for the sake of those left in the world. This is their obligation; it is the law of their adopted country, the kingdom into which they have, "by spiritual regeneration," been "born again".

All this, and much more, Baptism does. How does it do it?

(III) How does it do it?

This new Birth! How is it accomplished? Nobody knows. How Baptism causes all that it effects, is as yet unrevealed. The Holy Ghost moves upon the face of the waters, but His operation is overshadowed. Here, we are in the realm of faith. Faith is belief in that which is out of

sight. It is belief in the unseen, not in the non-existent. "We see not yet."[1] The *mode* of the operation of the Holy Ghost in Baptism is hidden: the result alone is revealed. In this, as in many another mystery, "We wait for light".[2]

[1] Rom. VIII. 25. [2] Is. LIX. 9.

CHAPTER VI.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

THE Blessed Sacrament!—or, as the Prayer Book calls it, "The Holy Sacrament". This title seems to sum up all the other titles by which the chief service in the Church is known. These are many. For instance:—

The Liturgy, from the Greek *Leitourgia*,[1] a public service.

The Mass, from the Latin *Missa*, dismissal—the word used in the Latin Liturgy when the people are dismissed,[2] and afterwards applied to the service itself from which they are dismissed.

The Eucharist, from the Greek *Eucharistia*, thanksgiving—the word used in all the narratives

[1] *Leitos*, public, *ergon*, work.

[2] Either when the service is over, or when those not admissible to Communion are dismissed. The "Masses" condemned in the thirty-first Article involved the heresy that Christ was therein offered *again* by the Mass Priest to buy souls out of Purgatory at so much per Mass.

of Institution,[1] and, technically, the third part of the Eucharistic Service.

The Breaking of the Bread, one of the earliest names for the Sacrament (Acts II. 42, 1 Cor. x. 16).

The Holy Sacrifice, which Christ once offered, and is ever offering.

The Lord's Supper (1 Cor. XII. 10), a name perhaps originally used for the *Agapé*, or love feast, which preceded the Eucharist, and then given to the Eucharist itself. It is an old English name, used in the story of St. Anselm's last days, where it is said: "He passed away as morning was breaking on the Wednesday before *the day of our Lord's Supper*".

The Holy Communion (1 Cor. x. 16), in which our baptismal union with Christ is consummated, and which forms a means of union between souls in the Church Triumphant, at Rest, and on Earth. In it, Christ, God and Man, is the bond of oneness.

All these, and other aspects of the Sacrament, are comprehended and gathered up in the name which marks its supremacy,—The Blessed Sacrament.

[1] E.g. St. Luke XXII. 15. "He took the cup, and *eucharized*," i.e. gave thanks.

Consider: *What it is;*
What it does;
How it does it.

(I) What it is.

It is the supernatural conjunction of matter and spirit, of Bread and Wine and of the Holy Ghost. Here, as in Baptism, the "inward and spiritual" expresses itself through the "outward and visible". Both must be there. And, notice again. This conjunction is not a *physical* conjunction, according to physical laws; nor is it a spiritual conjunction, according to spiritual laws; it is a Sacramental conjunction, according to Sacramental laws. As in Baptism, so in the Blessed Sacrament: the "outward and visible" is, and remains, subject to natural laws, and the inward and spiritual to spiritual laws; but the Sacrament itself is under neither natural nor spiritual but Sacramental laws.

For a perfect Sacrament requires both matter and spirit.[1] If either is absent, the Sacrament is incomplete.

Thus, the Council of Trent's definition of

[1] *Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit Sacramentum* (St. Augustine).

Transubstantiation[1] seems, as it stands, to spoil the very nature of a Sacrament. It is the "change of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, of the whole substance of the wine into the blood of Christ, *only the appearance* of bread and wine remaining".

Again, the Lutheran doctrine of *Consubstantiation* destroys the nature of the Sacrament. The Lutheran *Formula Concordiæ*, e.g., teaches that "*outside the use the Body of Christ is not present*". Thus it limits the Presence to the reception, whether by good or bad.

The *Figurative* view of the Blessed Sacrament

[1] This definition is really given up now by the best Roman Catholic theologians. The theory on which Transubstantiation alone is based (viz. that "substance" is something which exists apart from the totality of the accidents whereby it is known to us), has now been generally abandoned. Now, it is universally allowed that "substance is only a collective name for the sum of all the qualities of matter, size, colour, weight, taste, and so forth". But, as all these qualities of bread and wine admittedly remain after consecration, the substance of the bread and wine must remain too.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation condemned in Article 22, was that of a material Transubstantiation which taught (and was taught *ex Cathedra* by Pope Nicholas II) that Christ's Body was sensibly touched and broken by the teeth.

destroys the nature of a Sacrament, making the matter symbolize something which is not there.

It is safer to take the words of consecration as they stand, corresponding as they do so literally with the words of Institution, and simply to say: "This (bread: it is still bread) is My Body" (it is far more than bread); "this (wine: it is still wine) is My Blood" (it is far more than wine). Can we get beyond this, in terms and definitions? Can we say more than that it is a "Sacrament"—The Blessed Sacrament? And after all, do we wish to do so?

(II) What it does.

Briefly, the Blessed Sacrament does two things; It pleads, and It feeds. It is the pleading *of* the one Sacrifice; It is the feeding *on* the one Sacrifice.

These two aspects of the one Sacrament are suggested in the two names, *Altar* and *Table*.[1] Both words are liturgical. In Western Liturgies, *Altar* is the rule, and *Table* the exception; in Eastern Liturgies, *Table* is the rule, and *Altar*

[1] "The Altar has respect unto the oblation, the Table to the participation" (Bishop Cosin).

the exception. Both are, perhaps, embodied in the old name, *God's Board*, of Thomas Aquinas. Both contain a truth.

The Altar.

This, for over 300 years, was the common name for what St. Irenæus calls "the Abode of the Holy Body and Blood of Christ". Convocation, in 1640, decreed: "It is, and may be called, an Altar in that sense in which the Primitive Church called it an Altar, and in no other". This sense referred to the offering of what the Liturgy of St. James calls "the tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice," the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom "the reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice,"[1] and the Ancient English Liturgy "a pure offering, an holy offering, an undefiled offering, even the holy Bread of eternal Life, and the Cup of everlasting Salvation".

The word Altar, then, tells of the pleading of the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ. In the words of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to Leo XIII: "We plead and represent before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross"; or in the words of Charles Wesley: "To God it is an

[1] Cf. Jeremy Taylor's "Holy Living," chap. IV. s. 10.

Altar whereon men mystically present unto Him the same Sacrifice, as still suing for mercy"; or, in the words of Isaac Barrow: "Our Lord hath offered a well-pleasing Sacrifice for our sins, and doth, at God's right hand, continually renew it by presenting it unto God, and interceding with Him for the effect thereof".

The Sacrifice does not, of course, consist in the re-slaying of the Lamb, but in the offering of the Lamb as it had been slain. It is not the repetition of the Atonement, but the representation of the Atonement.[1] We offer on the earthly Altar the same Sacrifice that is being perpetually offered on the Heavenly Altar. There is only one Altar, only one Sacrifice, one Eucharist—"one offering, single and complete". All the combined earthly Altars are but one Altar—the earthly or visible part of the Heavenly Altar on which He, both Priest and Victim, offers Himself as the Lamb "as it had been slain". The Heavenly Altar is, as it were, the centre, and all the earthly Altars the circumference. We gaze at the Heavenly Altar through the Earthly Altars. We plead what He pleads; we offer what He offers.

[1] Cf. Bright's "Ancient Collects," p. 144.

Thus the Church, with exultation,
Till her Lord returns again,
Shows His Death; His mediation
Validates her worship then,
Pleading the Divine Oblation
Offered on the Cross for men.

And we must remember that in this offering the whole Three Persons in the Blessed Trinity are at work. We must not in our worship so concentrate our attention upon the Second Person, as to exclude the other Persons from our thoughts. Indeed, if one Person is more prominent than another, it is God the Father. It is to God the Father that the Sacrifice ascends; it is with Him that we plead on earth that which God the Son is pleading in Heaven; it is God the Holy Ghost Who makes our pleadings possible, Who turns the many Jewish Altars into the one Christian Altar. The *Gloria in Excelsis* bids us render worship to all three Persons engaged in this single act.

The Table.

The second aspect under consideration is suggested by the word *Table*—the "Holy Table," as St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Athanasius call it; "the tremendous Table," or the "Mystic

Table," as St. Chrysostom calls it; "the Lord's Table," or "this Thy Table," as, following the Easterns, our Prayer Book calls it.

This term emphasizes the Feast-aspect, as "Altar" underlines the Sacrificial aspect, of the Sacrament. In the "Lord's Supper" we feast upon the Sacrifice which has already been offered upon the Altar. "This Thy Table," tells of the Banquet of the Lamb. As St. Thomas puts it :—

> He gave Himself in either kind,
> His precious Flesh, His precious Blood:
> In Love's own fullness thus designed
> Of the whole man to be the Food.

Or, as Dr. Doddridge puts it, in his Sacramental *Ave*:—

> Hail! Sacred Feast, which Jesus makes!
> Rich Banquet of His Flesh and Blood!
> Thrice happy he, who here partakes
> That Sacred Stream, that Heavenly Food.

This is the Prayer-Book aspect, which deals with the "*Administration* of the Lord's Supper"; which bids us "feed upon Him (not it) in our hearts by faith," and not by sight; which speaks of the elements as God's "creatures of Bread and Wine"; which prays, in language of awful solemnity, that we may worthily "eat His Flesh

and drink His Blood". This is the aspect which speaks of the "means whereby" Christ communicates Himself to us, implants within us His character, His virtues, His will;—makes us one with Him, and Himself one with us. By Sacramental Communion, we "dwell in Him, and He in us"; and this, not merely as a lovely sentiment, or by means of some beautiful meditation, but by the real communion of Christ—present without us, and communicated to us, through the ordained channels.

Hence, in the Blessed Sacrament, Jesus is for ever counteracting within us the effects of the Fall. If the first Adam ruined us through food, the second Adam will reinstate us through food —and that food nothing less than Himself. "Feed upon *Him*." But how is all this brought about?

(III) How it does it.

Once again, nobody knows. The Holy Ghost is the operative power, but the operation is overshadowed as by the wings of the Dove. It is enough for us to know what is done, without questioning as to how it is done. It is enough for us to worship Him in what He does, without

straining to know how He does it—"being fully persuaded that, what He has promised, He is able also to perform".[1] Here, again, we are in the region of faith, not sight; and reason tells us that faith must be supreme in its own province. For us, it is enough to say with Queen Elizabeth :—

He was the Word that spake it;
He took the bread and break it;
And what that Word did make it,
I do believe and take it.[2]

[1] Rom. IV. 21.

[2] "These lines," says Malcomb MacColl in his book on "The Reformation Settlement" (p. 34), "have sometimes been attributed to Donne; but the balance of evidence is in favour of their Elizabethan authorship when the Queen was in confinement as Princess Elizabeth. They are not in the first edition of Donne, and were published for the first time as his in 1634, thirteen years after his death."

CHAPTER VII.

THE LESSER SACRAMENTS.

THESE are "those five" which the Article says are "commonly called Sacraments":[1] Confirmation, Matrimony, Orders, Penance, Unction. They are called "Lesser" Sacraments to distinguish them from the two pre-eminent or "Greater Sacraments," Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.[2] These, though they have not all a "like nature" with the Greater Sacraments, are selected by the Church as meeting the main needs of her children between Baptism and Burial.

They may, for our purpose, be classified in three groups :—

(I) *The Sacrament of Completion* (Confirmation, which completes the Sacrament of Baptism).

[1] Article XXV.

[2] The Homily on the Sacraments calls them the "other Sacraments"—i.e. in addition to Baptism and the Eucharist.

(II) *The Sacraments of Perpetuation* (Holy Matrimony, which perpetuates the human race; and Holy Order, which perpetuates the Christian Ministry).

(III) *The Sacraments of Recovery* (Penance, which recovers the sick soul together with the body; and Unction, which recovers the sick body together with the soul).

And, first, The Sacrament of *Completion:* Confirmation.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONFIRMATION.

(I) What it is not.
(II) What it is.
(III) Whom it is for.
(IV) What is essential.

(I) What it is not.

Confirmation is not the renewal of vows. The renewal of vows is the final part of the *preparation* for Confirmation. It is that part of the preparation which takes place in public, as the previous preparation has taken place in private. *Before* Confirmation, the Baptismal vows are renewed "openly before the Church". Their renewal is the last word of preparation. The Bishop, or Chief Shepherd, assures himself by question, and answer, that the Candidate openly responds to the preparation he has received in

private from the Parish Priest, or under-Shepherd. Before the last revision of the Prayer Book, the Bishop asked the Candidates in public many questions from the Catechism before confirming them; now he only asks one—and the "I do," by which the Candidate renews his Baptismal vows, is the answer to that preparatory question.

It is still quite a common idea, even among Church people, that Confirmation is something which the Candidate does for himself, instead of something which God does to him. This is often due to the unfortunate use of the word "confirm"[1] in the Bishop's question. At the time it was inserted, the word "confirm" meant "confess,"[2] and referred, not to the Gift of Confirmation, but to the Candidate's public Confession of faith, before receiving the Sacrament of Confirmation. It had nothing whatever to do with Confirmation itself. We must not, then, confuse the preparation for Confirmation with the Gift of Confirmation. The Sacrament itself is God's gift to the child bestowed through the Bishop in accordance with the teaching given to

[1] "Ratifying and *confirming* the same in your own persons."

[2] The word was "confess" in 1549.

the God-parents at the child's Baptism: "Ye are to take care that this child be brought to the Bishop *to be* confirmed *by him*".[1]

And this leads us to our second point: What Confirmation is.

(II) What it is.

Confirmation is the completion of Baptism. It completes what Baptism began. In the words of our Confirmation Service, it "increases and multiplies"—i.e. strengthens or confirms Baptismal grace. It is the ordained channel which conveys to the Baptized the "sevenfold" (i.e. complete) gift of the Holy Ghost, which was initially received in Baptism.

And this will help us to answer a question frequently asked: "If I have been confirmed, but not Baptized, must I be Baptized?" Surely, Baptism must *precede* Confirmation. If Con-

[1] The Greek Catechism of Plato, Metropolitan of Moscow, puts it very clearly: "Through this holy Ordinance *the Holy Ghost descendeth upon the person Baptized*, and confirmeth him in the grace which he received in his Baptism according to the example of His descending upon the disciples of Jesus Christ, and in imitation of the disciples themselves, who after Baptism laid their hands upon the believers; by which laying on of hands the Holy Ghost was conferred".

firmation increases the grace given in Baptism, that grace must have been received before it can be increased. "And must I be 'confirmed again,' as it is said, after Baptism?" Surely. If I had not been Baptized *before* I presented myself for Confirmation, I have not confirmed at all. My Baptism will now allow me to "be presented to the Bishop once again to be confirmed by him" —and this time in reality. "Did I, then, receive no grace when I was presented to the Bishop to be confirmed by him before?" Much grace, surely, but not the special grace attached to the special Sacrament of Confirmation, and guaranteed to the Confirmed. Special channels convey special grace. God's love overflows its channels; what God gives, or withholds, outside those channels, it would be an impertinence for us to say.

Again, Confirmation is, in a secondary sense, a Sacrament of Admittance. It admits the Baptized to Holy Communion. Two rubrics teach this. "It is expedient," says the rubric after an adult Baptism, "that every person thus Baptized should be confirmed by the Bishop so soon after his Baptism as conveniently may be; that *so he may be admitted to the Holy Communion.*" "And

there shall none *be admitted to Holy Communion*," adds the rubric after Confirmation, "until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." For "Confirmation, or the laying on of hands," fully admits the Baptized to that "Royal Priesthood" of the Laity,[1] of which the specially ordained Priest is ordained to be the representative. The Holy Sacrifice is the offering of the *whole* Church, the universal Priesthood, not merely of the individual Priest who is the offerer. Thus, the Confirmed can take their part in the offering, and can assist at it, in union with the ordained Priest who is actually celebrating. They can say their *Amen* at the Eucharist, or "giving of thanks," and give their responding assent to what he is doing in their name, and on their behalf.

And this answers another question. "If I am a Communicant, but have not been confirmed, ought I to present myself for Confirmation?" Surely. The Prayer Book is quite definite about this. First, it legislates for the normal case, then for the abnormal. First it says: "None shall be admitted to Holy Communion until such time as they have been Confirmed". Then it deals with

[1] 1 St. Peter II. 9.

exceptional cases, and adds, "or be willing and desirous to be confirmed". Such exceptional cases may, and do, occur; but even these may not be Communicated unless they are both "ready" and "desirous" to be confirmed, as soon as Confirmation can be received. So does the Church safeguard her Sacraments, and her children.

"But would you," it is asked, "exclude a Dissenter from Communion, however good and holy he may be, merely because he has not been Confirmed?" He certainly would have very little respect for me if I did not. If, for instance, he belonged to the Methodist Society, he would assuredly not admit me to be a "Communicant" in that Society. "No person," says his rule, "shall be suffered on any pretence to partake of the Lord's Supper *unless he be a member of the Society*, or receive a note of admission from the Superintendent, which note must be renewed quarterly." And, again: "That the Table of the Lord should be open to all comers, is surely a great discredit, and a serious peril to any Church".[1] And yet the Church, the Divine Society, established by Jesus Christ Himself, is blamed, and called narrow and

[1] Minutes of Wesleyan Conference, 1889, p. 412.

bigoted, if she asserts her own rule, and refuses to admit "all comers" to the Altar. To give way on such a point would be to forfeit, and rightly to forfeit, the respect of any law-abiding people, and would be—in many cases, is—"a great discredit, and a serious peril" to the Church. We have few enough rules as it is, and if those that we have are meaningless, we may well be held up to derision. The Prayer Book makes no provision whatever for those who are not Confirmed, and who, if able to receive Confirmation, are neither "ready nor desirous to be Confirmed".

(III) Whom it is for.

Confirmation is for the Baptized, and none other. The Prayer-Book Title to the service is plain. It calls Confirmation the "laying on of Hands upon *those that are baptized*," and, it adds, "are come to years of discretion".

First, then, Confirmation is for the Baptized, and never for the unbaptized.

Secondly, it is (as now administered[1]) for

[1] In the first ages, and, indeed, until the fifteenth century, Confirmation followed immediately after Baptism, both in East and West, as it still does in the East.

"those who have come to years of discretion," i.e. for those who are fit for it. As we pray in the Ember Collect that the Bishop may select "fit persons for the Sacred Ministry" of the special Priesthood, and may "lay hands suddenly on no man," so it is with Confirmation or the "laying on of hands" for the Royal Priesthood. The Bishop must be assured by the Priest who presents them (and who acts as his examining Chaplain), that they are "fit persons" to be confirmed.

And this fitness must be of two kinds: moral and intellectual. It must be *moral.* The candidate must "have come to years of discretion," i.e. he must "know to refuse the evil and choose the good".[1] This "age of discretion," or *competent age*, as the Catechism Rubric calls it, is not a question of years, but of character. Our present Prayer Book makes no allusion to any definite span of years whatever, and to make the magic age of fifteen the minimum universal age for Candidates is wholly illegal. At the Reformation, the English Church fixed seven as the age for Confirmation, but our 1662 Prayer Book is more primitive, and, taking a common-sense view,

[1] Is. VII. 16.

leaves each case of moral fitness to be decided on its own merits. The moral standard must be an individual standard, and must be left, first, to the parent, who presents the child to the Priest to be prepared; then, to the Priest who prepares the child for Confirmation, and presents him to the Bishop; and, lastly, to the Bishop, who must finally decide, upon the combined testimony of the Priest and parent—and, if in doubt, upon his own personal examination.

The *intellectual* standard is laid down in the Service for the "Public Baptism of Infants": "So soon as he can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar (i.e. his native) tongue, and be further instructed, etc." Here, the words "can say" obviously mean can say *intelligently*. The mere saying of the words by rote is comparatively unimportant, though it has its use; but if this were all, it would degrade the Candidate's intellectual status to the capacities of a parrot. But, "as soon as" he can intelligently comply with the Church's requirements, as soon as he has reached "a competent age," any child may "be presented to the Bishop to be confirmed by him".

And, in the majority of cases, in these days, "the sooner, the better". It is, speaking generally, far safer to have the "child" prepared at home—if it is a Christian home—and confirmed from home, than to risk the preparation to the chance teaching of a Public School. With splendid exceptions, School Confirmation is apt to get confused with the school curriculum and school lessons. It is a sort of "extra tuition," which, not infrequently, interferes with games or work, without any compensating advantages in Church teaching.

(IV) What is Essential.

"The Laying on of Hands"—and nothing else. This act of ritual (so familiar to the Early Church, from Christ's act in blessing little children) was used by the Apostles,[1] and is still used by their successors, the Bishops. It is the only act essential to a valid Confirmation.

Other, and suggestive, ceremonies have been in use in different ages, and in different parts of the Church: but they are supplementary, not essential. Thus, in the sub-apostolic age, ritual

[1] Acts viii. 12-17; Acts xix. 5, 6.

acts expressed very beautifully the early names for Confirmation, just as "the laying on of Hands" still expresses the name which in the English Church proclaims the essence of the Sacrament.

For instance, Confirmation is called *The Anointing*,[1] and *The Sealing*, and in some parts of the Church, the Priest dips his finger in oil blessed by the Bishop, and signs or seals the child upon the forehead with the sign of the Cross, thus symbolizing the meaning of such names. But neither the sealing, nor the anointing, is necessary for a valid Sacrament.

Confirmation, then, "rightly and duly" administered, completes the grace given to a child at the outset of its Christian career. It admits the child to full membership and to full privileges in the Christian Church. It is the ordained Channel by which the Bishop is commissioned to convey and guarantee the special grace attached

[1] In an old seventh century Service, used in the Church of England down to the Reformation, the Priest is directed: "Here he is to put the Chrism (oil) on the forehead of the man, and say, 'Receive the sign of the Holy Cross, by the Chrism of Salvation in Jesus Christ unto Eternal Life. Amen.'"

to, and only to, the Lesser Sacrament of Confirmation.[1]

[1] The teaching of our Church of England, passing on the teaching of the Church Universal, is very happily summed up in an ancient Homily of the Church of England. It runs thus: "In Baptism the Christian was born again spiritually, to live; in Confirmation he is made bold to fight. There he received remission of sin; here he receiveth increase of grace. . . . In Baptism he was chosen to be God's son; in Confirmation God shall give him His Holy Spirit to . . . perfect him. In Baptism he was called and chosen to be one of God's soldiers, and had his white coat of innocency given him, and also his badge, which was the red cross set upon his forehead . . . ; in Confirmation he is encouraged to fight, and to take the armour of God put upon him, which be able to bear off the fiery darts of the devil."

CHAPTER IX.

HOLY MATRIMONY.

We have called Holy Matrimony the "*Sacrament of Perpetuation*," for it is the ordained way in which the human race is to be perpetuated.

Matrimony is the legal union between two persons,—a union which is created by mutual consent: Holy Matrimony is that union sanctioned and sanctified by the Church.

There are three familiar names given to this union: Matrimony, Marriage, Wedlock.

Matrimony, derived from *mater*, a mother, tells of the woman's (i.e. wife-man's) "joy that a man is born into the world". Marriage, derived from *maritus*, a husband (or house-dweller[1]), tells of the man's place in the "hus" or house. Wedlock, derived from *weddian*, a pledge, reminds both man and woman of the life-long pledge which each has made "either to other".

[1] Husband—from *hus*, a house, and *buan*, to dwell.

It is this Sacrament of Matrimony, Marriage, or Wedlock, that we are now to consider. We will think of it under four headings :—

(I) What is it for?

(II) What is its essence?

(III) Whom is it for?

(IV) What are its safeguards?

(I) What is it for?

Marriage is, as we have seen, God's method of propagating the human race. It does this in two ways—by expansion, and by limitation. This is seen in the New Testament ordinance, "one man for one woman". It expands the race, but within due and disciplined limitations. Expansion, without limitation, would produce quantity without quality, and would wreck the human race; limitation without expansion might produce quality without quantity, but would extinguish the human race. Like every other gift of God, marriage is to be treated "soberly, wisely, discretely," and, like every other gift, it must be used with a due combination of freedom and restraint.

Hence, among other reasons, the marriage union between one man and one woman is

indissoluble. For marriage is not a mere union of sentiment; it is not a mere terminable contract between two persons, who have agreed to live together as long as they suit each other. It is an *organic* not an emotional union; "They twain shall be one flesh," which nothing but death can divide. No law in Church or State can unmarry the legally married. A State may *declare* the non-existence of the marriage union, just as it may *declare* the non-existence of God: but such a declaration does not affect the fact, either in one case or the other.

In England the State does, in certain cases, declare that the life-long union is a temporary contract, and does permit "this man" or "this woman" to live with another man, or with another woman, and, if they choose, even to exchange husbands or wives. This is allowed by the Divorce Act of 1857,[1] "when," writes Bishop Stubbs, "the calamitous legislation of 1857 inflicted on English Society and English morals

[1] Until fifty-three years ago an Act of Parliament was necessary for a divorce. In 1857 *The Matrimonial Causes Act* established the Divorce Court. In 1873 the *Indicature Act* transferred it to a division of the High Court—the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.

the most cruel blow that any conjunction of unrighteous influence could possibly have contrived".[1]

The Church has made no such declaration. It rigidly forbids a husband or wife to marry again during the lifetime of either party. The Law of the Church remains the Law of the Church, overridden—but not repealed. This has led to a conflict between Church and State in a country where they are, in theory though not in fact, united. But this is the fault of the State, not of the Church. It is a case in which a junior partner has acted without the consent of, or rather in direct opposition to, the senior partner. Historically and chronologically speaking, the Church (the senior partner) took the State (the junior partner) into partnership, and the State, in spite of all the benefits it has received from the Church, has taken all it could get, and has thrown the Church over to legalize sin. It has ignored its senior partner, and loosened the old historical bond between the two. This the Church cannot help, and this the State fully admits, legally absolving the Church from taking any part in its mock re-marriages.

[1] "Visitation Charges," p. 252.

(II) What is its Essence?

The essence of matrimony is "mutual consent". The essential part of the Sacrament consists in the words: "I, M., take thee, N.," etc. Nothing else is essential, though much else is desirable. Thus, marriage in a church, however historical and desirable, is not *essential* to the validity of a marriage. Marriage at a Registry Office (i.e. mutual consent in the presence of the Registrar) is every bit as legally indissoluble as marriage in a church. The not uncommon argument: "I was only married in a Registry Office, and can therefore take advantage of the Divorce Act," is fallacious *ab initio*.[1]

Why, then, be married in, and by the Church? Apart from the history and sentiment, for this reason. The Church is the ordained channel through which grace to keep the marriage vow is bestowed. A special and *guaranteed* grace is

[1] It is a common legal error that seven years effective separation between husband and wife entitles either to remarry, and hundreds of women who have lost sight of their husbands for seven years innocently commit bigamy. Probably the mistake comes from the fact that a *prosecution* for bigamy does not hold good in such a case. But this does not legalize the bigamous marriage or legitimize the children.

attached to a marriage sanctioned and blest by the Church. The Church, in the name of God, "consecrates matrimony," and from the earliest times has given its sanction and blessing to the mutual consent. We are reminded of this in the question: "Who *giveth* this woman to be married to this man?" In answer to the question, the Parent, or Guardian, presents the Bride to the Priest (the Church's representative), who, in turn, presents her to the Bridegroom, and blesses their union. In the Primitive Church, notice of marriage had to be given to the Bishop of the Diocese, or his representative,[1] in order that due inquiries might be made as to the fitness of the persons, and the Church's sanction given or withheld. After this notice, a special service of *Betrothal* (as well as the actual marriage service) was solemnized.

These two separate services are still marked off from each other in (though both forming a part of) our present marriage service. The first part of the service is held outside the chancel gates, and corresponds to the old service of *Betrothal*. Here, too, the actual ceremony of "mutual consent" now takes place—that part of

[1] The origin of Banns.

the ceremony which would be equally valid in a Registry Office. Then follows the second part of the service, in which the Church gives her blessing upon the marriage. And because this part is, properly speaking, part of the Eucharistic Office, the Bride and Bridegroom now go to the Altar with the Priest, and there receive the Church's Benediction, and—ideally—their first Communion after marriage. So does the Church provide grace for her children that they may "perform the vows they have made unto the King". The late hour for modern weddings, and the consequent postponement[1] of Communion, has obscured much of the meaning of the service; but a nine o'clock wedding, in which the married couple receive the Holy Communion, followed by the wedding breakfast, is, happily, becoming more common, and is restoring to us one of the best of old English customs. It is easy enough to slight old religious forms and ceremonies; but is anyone one atom better, or happier for having neglected them?

[1] The Rubric says: "It is convenient that the new-married persons receive the Holy Communion *at the time of their marriage*, or at the first opportunity after their marriage," thus retaining, though releasing, the old rule.

(III) Whom is it for?

Marriage is for three classes :—

(1) The unmarried—i.e. those who have never been married, or whose marriage is (legally) dissolved by death.

(2) The non-related—i.e. either by consanguinity (by blood), or affinity (by marriage).

(3) The full-aged.

(1) *The Unmarried.*

Obviously, marriage is only for the unmarried. But, is not this very hard upon those whose marriage has been a mistake, and who have been divorced by the State? And, above all, is it not very hard upon the innocent party, who has been granted a divorce? It is very hard, so hard, so terribly hard, that only those who have to deal personally, and practically, with concrete cases, can guess how hard—hard enough often on the guilty party, and harder still on the innocent. "God knows" it is hard, and will make it as easy as God Himself can make it, if only self-surrender is placed before self-indulgence. But the alternative is still harder. We sometimes forget that legislation for the individual may bear even harder

on the masses, than legislation for the masses may bear upon the individual. And, after all, this is not a question of "hard *versus* easy," but of "right *versus* wrong". Moreover, as we are finding out, that which seems easiest at the moment, often turns out hardest in the long run. It is no longer contended that re-marriage after a State-divorce is that universal Elysium which it has always been confidently assumed to be.

There is, too, a positively absurd side to the present conflict between Church and State. Here is a case in point. Some time ago, a young girl married a man about whom she knew next to nothing, the man telling her that marriage was only a temporary affair, and that, if it did not answer, the State would divorce them. It did not answer. Wrong-doing ensued, and a divorce was obtained. Then the girl entered into a State-marriage with another man. But that answered no better. A divorce was again applied for, but this time was refused. Eventually, the girl left her State-made husband, and ran away with her real husband. In other words, she eloped with her own husband. But what is her position to-day? In the eyes of the State, she is now living with a man who is not

her husband. Her State-husband is still alive, and can apply, at any moment, for an order for the restitution of conjugal rights—however unlikely he is to get it. Further, if in the future she has any children by her real husband (unless she has been married again to him, after divorce from her State-husband) these children will be illegitimate. This is the sort of muddle the Divorce Act has got us into. One course, and only one course, is open to the Church—to disentangle itself from all question of extending the powers of the Act on grounds of inequality, or any other real (and sometimes very real) or fancied hardship, and to consistently fight for the repeal of the Act. This, it will be said, is *Utopian.* Exactly! It is the business of the Church to aim at the Utopian. Her whole history shows that she is safest, as well as most successful, when aiming at what the world derides.

One question remains: Is not the present Divorce Law "one law for the rich and another for the poor"? Beyond all question. This is its sole merit, if merit it can have. It does, at least, partially protect the poor from sin-made-easy—a condition which money has bought for the rich. If the State abrogated the Sixth Com-

mandment for the rich, and made it lawful for a rich man to commit murder, it would at least be no demerit if it refused to extend the permit to the poor.

(2) *The Non-Related.*

But, secondly, marriage is for the *non-related* —non-related, that is, in two ways, by Consanguinity, and Affinity.

(*a*) By *Consanguinity.* Consanguinity is of two kinds, lineal and collateral. *Lineal* Consanguinity[1] is blood relationship "in a *direct* line," i.e. from a common ancestor. *Collateral* Consanguinity is blood relationship from a common ancestor, but not in a direct line.

The law of Consanguinity has not, at the present moment, been attacked, and is still the law of the land.

(*b*) By *Affinity.* Affinity[2] is near relationship by marriage. It is of three kinds: (1) *Direct*, i.e. between a husband and his wife's blood relations, and between a wife and her husband's blood relations; (2) *Secondary*, i.e. between a husband

[1] Consanguinity—from *cum*, together, and *sanguineus*, relating to blood.

[2] Affinity—from *ad*, near, and *finis*, a boundary.

and his wife's relations by marriage; (3) *Collateral*, i.e. between a husband and the relations of his wife's relations. In case of Affinity, the State has broken faith with the Church without scruple, and the *Deceased Wife's Sister Bill*[1] is the result. So has it

brought confusion to the Table round.

The question is sometimes asked, whether the State can alter the Church's law without her consent. An affirmative answer would reduce whatever union still remains between them to its lowest possible term, and would place the Church in a position which no Nonconformist body would tolerate for a day. The further question, as to whether the State can order the Church to Communicate persons who have openly and deliberately broken her laws, needs no discussion. No thinking person seriously contends that it can.

(3) *For the Full-Aged.*

No boy under 14, and no girl under 12, can contract a legal marriage either *with, or without* the consent of Parents or Guardians. No man

[1] See a most helpful paper read by Father Puller at the E.C.U. Anniversary Meeting, and reported in "The Church Times" of 17 June, 1910.

or woman under 21 can do so *against* the consent of Parents or Guardians.

(IV) What are its Safeguards?

These are, mainly, two: *Banns* and *Licences* —both intended to secure the best safeguard of all, *publicity*. This publicity is secured, first, by Banns.

(1) *Banns.*

The word is the plural form of *Ban*, "a proclamation". The object of this proclamation is to "ban" an improper marriage.

In the case of marriage after Banns, in order to secure publicity:—

(1) Each party must reside[1] for twenty-one days in the parish where the Banns are being published.

(2) The marriage must be celebrated in one of the two parishes in which the Banns have been published.

[1] There seems to be no legal definition of the word "reside". The law would probably require more than leaving a bag in a room, hired for twenty-one days, as is often done. It must be remembered that the object of the law is *publicity* —that is, the avoidance of a clandestine marriage, which marriage at a Registry Office now frequently makes so fatally easy.

(3) Seven days' previous notice of publication must be given to the clergy by whom the Banns are to be published—though the clergy may remit this length of notice if they choose.

(4) The Banns must be published on three separate (though not necessarily successive) Sundays.

(5) Before the marriage, a certificate of publication must be presented to the officiating clergyman, from the clergyman of the other parish in which the Banns were published.

(6) Banns only hold good for three months. After this period, they must be again published three times before the marriage can take place.

(7) Banns may be forbidden on four grounds: If either party is married already; or is related by consanguinity or affinity; or is under age; or is insane.

(8) Banns published in false names invalidate a marriage, if both parties are cognisant of the fact before the marriage takes place, i.e. if they wilfully intend to defeat the law, but not otherwise.

(2) *Licences.*

There are two kinds of Marriage Licence, an Ordinary, or Common Licence, and a Special Licence.

An *Ordinary Licence*, costing about £2, is granted by the Bishop, or Ordinary, in lieu of Banns, either through his Chancellor, or a "Surrogate," i.e. substitute. In marriage by Licence, three points may be noticed :—

(1) One (though only one) of the parties must reside in the parish where the marriage is to be celebrated, for fifteen days previous to the marriage.

(2) One of the parties must apply for the Licence in person, not in writing.

(3) A licence only holds good for three months.

A *Special Licence*, costing about £30, can only be obtained from the Archbishop of Canterbury,[1] and is only granted after special and minute inquiry. The points here to notice are :—

(1) Neither party need reside in the parish where the marriage is to be solemnized.

(2) The marriage may be celebrated in any Church, whether licensed or unlicensed[2] for marriages.

(3) It may be celebrated at any time of the day.

It may be added that if any clergyman cele-

[1] 25 Hen. VIII, cap. 21.

[2] Such as, for example, Royal Chapels, St. Paul's Cathedral, Eton College Chapel, etc.

brates a marriage without either Banns or Licence (or upon a Registrar's Certificate), he commits a felony, and is liable to fourteen years' penal servitude.[1]

Other safeguards there are, such as :—

The Time for Marriages.—Marriages must not be celebrated before 8 A.M., or after 3 P.M., so as to provide a reasonable chance of publicity.

The Witnesses to a Marriage.—Two witnesses, at least, must be present, in addition to the officiating clergyman.

The Marriage Registers.—The officiating clergyman must enter the marriage in two Registers provided by the State.

The Signing of the Registers.—The bride and bridegroom must sign their names in the said Registers immediately after the ceremony, as well as the two witnesses and the officiating clergyman. If either party wilfully makes any false statement with regard to age, condition, etc., he or she is guilty of perjury.

Such are some of the wise safeguards provided by both Church and State for the Sacrament of Marriage. Their object is to prevent the mar-

[1] Cf. Blunt's "Church Law," p. 133; 4 Geo. IV, c. 76, s. 21.

riage state being entered into "lightly, unadvisedly, or wantonly," to secure such publicity as will prevent clandestine marriages,[1] and will give parents, and others with legal status, an opportunity to lodge legal objections.

Great is the solemnity of the Sacrament in which is "signified and represented the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church".

[1] It will be remembered that runaway marriages were, in former days, frequently celebrated at Gretna Green, a Scotch village in Dumfriesshire, near the English border.

CHAPTER X.

HOLY ORDER.

The Second Sacrament of Perpetuation is Holy Order. As the Sacrament of Marriage perpetuates the human race, so the Sacrament of Order perpetuates the Priesthood. Holy Order, indeed, perpetuates the Sacraments themselves. It is the ordained channel through which the Sacramental life of the Church is continued.

Holy Order, then, was instituted for the perpetuation of those Sacraments which depend upon Apostolic Succession. It makes it possible for the Christian laity to be Confirmed, Communicated, Absolved. Thus, the Christian Ministry is a great deal more than a body of men, chosen as officers might be chosen in the army or navy. It is the Church's media for the administration of the Sacraments of Salvation. To say this does not assert that God cannot, and does not, save and sanctify souls in any other way; but it does assert, as Scripture does, that the Chris-

tian Ministry is the authorized and ordained way.

The Threefold Ministry.

In this Ministry, there are three orders, or degrees: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. In the words of the Prayer Book: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that, from the Apostles' time, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons".[1]

(I) Bishops.

Who was the first Bishop? Jesus Christ, "the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls". When, and where, was the first Ordination? In the Upper Chamber, when He, the Universal Bishop, Himself ordained the first Apostles. When was

[1] "The Threefold Ministry," writes Bishop Lightfoot, "can be traced to Apostolic direction; and, short of an express statement, we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment, or, at least, a Divine Sanction." And he adds, speaking of his hearty desire for union with the Dissenters, "we cannot surrender for any immediate advantages the threefold Ministry which we have inherited from Apostolic times, and which is *the historic backbone of the Church*" ("Ep. to the Philippians," p. 276, later ed.).

the second Ordination? When these Apostles ordained Matthias to succeed Judas. This was the first link in the chain of Apostolic Succession. What followed? In apostolic days, Timothy was ordained, with episcopal jurisdiction over Ephesus; Titus, over Crete; Polycarp (the friend of St. John), over Smyrna; and then, later on, Linus, over Rome. And so the great College of Bishops expands until, in the second century, we read in a well-known writer, St. Irenæus: "We can reckon up lists of Bishops ordained in the Churches from the Apostles to our time". Link after link, the chain of succession lengthens "throughout all the world," until it reaches the Early British Church, and then, in 597, the English Church, through the consecration of Augustine,[1] first Archbishop of Canterbury, and in 1903 of Randall Davidson his ninety-fourth successor.

And this is the history of every ordination in the Church to-day. "It is through the Apostolic Succession," said the late Bishop Stubbs to his ordination Candidates, "that I am empowered, through the long line of mission and Commission

[1] The Welsh Bishops did not transmit Episcopacy to us, but rather came into us.

from the Upper Chamber at Jerusalem, to lay my hands upon you and send you."[1]

How does a Priest become a Bishop? In the Church of England he goes through four stages :—

(1) He is *nominated* by the Crown.

(2) He is *elected* by the Church.

(3) His election is *confirmed* by the Archbishop.

(4) He is *consecrated* by the Episcopate.

(1) He is *nominated* by the Crown. This is in accordance with the immemorial custom of this realm. In these days, the Prime Minister (representing the people) proposes the name of a Priest to the King, who accepts or rejects the recommendation. If he accepts it, the King nominates the selected Priest to the Church for election, and authorizes the issue of legal documents for such election. This is called *Conge d'élire*, "leave to elect".

(2) He is *elected* by the Church. The King's

[1] In a book called *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*, Bishop Stubbs has traced the name, date of Consecration, names of Consecrators, and in most cases place of Consecration, of every Bishop in the Church of England from the Consecration of Augustine.

nominee now comes before the Dean and Chapter (representing the Church), and the Church either elects or rejects him. It has power to do either. If the nominee is elected, what is called his "Confirmation" follows—that is :—

(3) His election is *Confirmed* by the Archbishop of Canterbury, according to a right reserved to him by *Magna Charta.* Before confirming the election, the Archbishop, or his representative, sits in public, generally at Bow Church, Cheapside, to hear legal objections from qualified laity against the election. Objections were of late, it will be remembered, made, and overruled, in the cases of Dr. Temple and Dr. Gore. Then, if duly nominated, elected, and confirmed,—

(4) He is *consecrated* by the Episcopate. To safeguard the Succession, three Bishops, at least, are required for the Consecration of another Bishop, though one would secure a valid Consecration. No Priest can be Consecrated Bishop under the age of thirty. Very carefully does the Church safeguard admission to the Episcopate.

Homage.

After Consecration, the Bishop "does homage,"[1] i.e. he says that he, like any other subject (ecclesiastic or layman), is the King's "*homo*". What does he do homage for? He does homage, not for any spiritual gift, but for "all the possessions, and profette spirituall and temporall belongyng to the said . . . Bishopricke".[2] The *temporal* possessions include such things as his house, revenue, etc. But what is meant by doing homage for *spiritual* possessions? Does not this admit the claim that the King can, as Queen Elizabeth is reported to have said, make or unmake a Bishop? No. Spiritual *possessions* do not here mean spiritual *powers*,—powers which can be conferred by the Episcopate alone.

[1] The Bishops are one of the three Estates of the Realm —Lords Spiritual, Lords Temporal, and Commons (not, as is so often said, King, Lords, and Commons). The Archbishop of Canterbury is the first Peer of the Realm, and has precedency immediately after the blood royal. The Archbishop of York has precedency over all Dukes, not being of royal blood, and over all the great officers of State, except the Lord Chancellor. He has the privilege of crowning the Queen Consort.

[2] Cf. "Encyclopedia of the Laws of England," vol. II, p. 156; and 25 Hen. VIII, cap. 2, s. 6.

The "spiritual possessions" for which a Bishop "does homage" refer to fees connected with spiritual things, such as Episcopal Licences, Institutions to Benefices, Trials in the Ecclesiastical Court, Visitations—fees, by the way, which, with very rare exceptions, do not go into the Bishop's own pocket!

Jurisdiction.

What is meant by Episcopal Jurisdiction? Jurisdiction is of two kinds, *Habitual* and *Actual.*

Habitual Jurisdiction is the Jurisdiction given to a Bishop to exercise his office in the Church at large. It is conveyed with Consecration, and is given to the Bishop as a Bishop of the Catholic Church. Thus an Episcopal act, duly performed, would be valid, however irregular, outside the Bishop's own Diocese, and in any part of the Church.

Actual Jurisdiction is this universal Jurisdiction limited to a particular area, called a Diocese. To this area, a Bishop's right to exercise his Habitual Jurisdiction is, for purposes of order and business, confined.

The next order in the Ministry is the Priesthood.

(II) Priests.

No one can read the Prayer-Book Office for the *Ordering of Priests* without being struck by its contrast to the ordinary conception of Priesthood by the average Englishman. The Bishop's words in the Ordination Service: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God," must surely mean more than that a Priest should try to be a good organizer, a good financier, a good preacher, or good at games—though the better he is at all these, the better it may be. But the gift of the Holy Ghost for "the Office and Work of a Priest" must mean more than this.

We may consider it in connexion with four familiar English clerical titles: *Priest*, *Minister*, *Parson*, *Clergyman*.

Priest.

According to the Prayer Book, a Priest, or Presbyter, is ordained to do three things, which he, and he alone, can do: to Absolve, to Consecrate, to Bless.

He, and he alone, can *Absolve*. Think! It is the day of his Ordination to the Priesthood. He is saying Matins as a Deacon just *before* his

Ordination, and he is forbidden to pronounce the Absolution: he is saying Evensong just *after* his Ordination, and he is ordered to pronounce the Absolution.

He, and he alone, can *Consecrate*. If a Deacon pretends to Consecrate the Elements at the Blessed Sacrament, not only is his act sacrilege and invalid, but even by the law of the land he is liable to a penalty of £100.[1]

He, and he alone, can give the *Blessing*—i.e. the Church's official Blessing. The right of Benediction belongs to him as part of his Ministerial Office. The Blessing pronounced by a Deacon might be the personal blessing of a good and holy man, just as the blessing of a layman —a father blessing his child—might be of value as such. In each case it would be a personal act. But a Priest does not bless in his own name, but in the name of the Whole Church. It is an official, not a personal act: he conveys, not his own, but the Church's blessing to the people.

Hence, the valid Ordination of a Priest is of essential importance to the laity.

[1] 14 Car. II, c. 4, s. 10. See Phillimore's "Ecclesiastical Law," vol. I, p. 109.

But there is another aspect of "the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God". This we see in the word

Minister.

The Priest not only ministers before God on behalf of his people, but he ministers to his people on behalf of God. In this aspect of the Priesthood, he ministers God's gifts to the laity. If, as a Priest, he pleads the One Sacrifice on behalf of the people, as a Minister he feeds the people upon the one Sacrifice. His chief ministerial duty is to minister to the people —to give them Baptism, Absolution, Holy Communion; to minister to all their spiritual needs whenever, and wherever, he is needed.

It is, surely, a sad necessity that this ministerial "office and work" should be so often confused with finance, doles, charities, begging sermons, committees, etc. In all such things he is, indeed, truly serving and ministering; but he is often obliged to place them in the wrong order of importance, and so dim the sight of the laity to his real position, and not infrequently make his spiritual ministrations unacceptable. A well-known and London-wide respected Priest said

shortly before he died, that he had almost scattered his congregation by the constant "begging sermons" which he hated, but which necessity made imperative. The laity are claiming (and rightly claiming) the privilege of being Church workers, and are preaching (and rightly preaching) that "the Clergy are not the Church". If only they would practise what they preach, and relieve the Clergy of all Church finance, they need never listen to another "begging sermon" again. So doing, they would rejoice the heart of the Clergy, and fulfil one of their true functions as laity.

The Parson.

This is one of the most beautiful of all the clerical names, only it has become smirched by common use.

The word Parson is derived from *Persona*, a *person*. The Parson is *the* Person—the Person who represents God in the Parish. It is not his own person, or position, that he stands for, but the position and Person of his Master. Like St. Paul, he can say, "I magnify mine office," and probably the best way to magnify his office will be to minimize himself. The outward marks of

respect still shown to "the Parson" in some places, are not necessarily shown to the person himself (though often, thank God, they may be), but are meant, however unconsciously, to honour the Person he represents—just as the lifting of the hat to a woman is not, of necessity, a mark of respect to the individual woman, but a tribute to the Womanhood she represents.

The Parson, then, is, or should be, the official person, the standing element in the parish, who reminds men of God.

Clergyman.

The word is derived from the Greek *kleros*,[1] "a lot," and conveys its own meaning. According to some, it takes us back in thought to the first Apostolic Ordination, when "they cast *lots*, and the *lot* fell upon Matthias". It reminds us that, as Matthias "was numbered with the eleven," so a "Clergyman" is, at his Ordination, numbered with that long list of "Clergy" who trace their spiritual pedigree to Apostolic days.

[1] But see Skeat, whose references are to κλῆρος, "a lot," in late Greek, and the Clergy whose portion is the Lord (Deut. xviii. 2, 1 Pet. v. 3, cf. Acts i. 17). The κλῆρος is thus the portion rather than the circumstance by which it is obtained, i.e. Acts i. 17 rather than Acts i. 26.

Ordination Safeguards.

"Seeing then," run the words of the Ordination Service, "into how high a dignity, and how weighty an Office and Charge" a Priest is called, certain safeguards surround his Ordination, both for his own sake, and for the sake of his people.

Age.

No Deacon can, save under very exceptional circumstances, be ordained Priest before he is 24, and has served at least a year in the Diaconate.

Fitness.

This fitness, as in Confirmation, will be intellectual and moral. His *intellectual* fitness is tested by the Bishop's Examining Chaplain some time before the Ordination to the Priesthood, and, in doubtful cases, by the Bishop himself.

His *moral* fitness is tested by the Publication during Service, in the Church where he is Deacon, of his intention to offer himself as a Candidate for the Priesthood. To certify that this has been done, this Publication must be signed by the Churchwarden, representing the

laity, and by the Incumbent, representing the Clergy and responsible to the Bishop.

Further safeguard is secured by letters of Testimony from three Beneficed Clergy, who have known the Candidate well either for the past three years, or during the term of his Diaconate.

Finally, at the very last moment, in the Ordination Service itself, the Bishop invites the laity, if they know "any impediment or notable crime" disqualifying the Candidate from being ordained Priest, to "come forth in the Name of God, and show what the crime or impediment is".

Why all these safeguards? For many obvious reasons, but specially for one. Priest's Orders are indelible.

The Indelibility of Orders.

Once a Priest, always a Priest. When once the Bishop has ordained a Deacon to the Priesthood, there is no going back. The law, ecclesiastical or civil, may deprive him of the right to *exercise* his Office, but no power can deprive him of the Office itself.

For instance, to safeguard the Church, and for

the sake of the laity, a Priest may, for various offences, be what is commonly called "unfrocked". He may be degraded, temporarily suspended, or permanently forbidden to *officiate* in any part of the Church; but he does not cease to be a Priest. Any Priestly act, rightly and duly performed, would be valid, though irregular. It would be for the people's good, though it would be to his own hurt.

Again: by *The Clerical Disabilities Act* of 1870, a Priest may, by the law of the land, execute a "Deed of Relinquishment," and, as far as the law is concerned, return to lay life. This would enable him legally to undertake lay work which the law forbids to the Clergy.[1]

He may, in consequence, regain his legal rights as a layman, and lose his legal rights as a Priest; but he does not cease to be a Priest. The law can only touch his civil status, and cannot touch his priestly "character". That is indelible.

Hence, no securities can be superfluous to safeguard the irrevocable.

[1] For example: farming more than a certain number of acres, or going into Parliament.

Jurisdiction.

As in the case of the Bishops, a Priest's jurisdiction is twofold—*habitual* and *actual.* Ordination confers on him *habitual* jurisdiction, i.e. the power to exercise his office, to Absolve, to Consecrate, to Bless, in the "Holy Church throughout the world". And, as in the case of Bishops, for purposes of ecclesiastical order and discipline, this Habitual Jurisdiction is limited to the sphere in which the Bishop licenses him. "Take thou authority," says the Bishop, "to preach the word of God, and to minister the Sacraments *in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.*" This is called *Actual* Jurisdiction.

The Essence of the Sacrament.

The absolutely essential part of Ordination is the Laying on of Hands (1 Tim. iv. 14; Acts vi. 6; 2 Tim. i. 6). Various other and beautiful ceremonies have, at different times, and in different places, accompanied the essential Rite. Sometimes, and in some parts of the Church, Unction, or anointing the Candidate with oil, has been used: sometimes Ordination has been accompanied with the delivery of a Ring, the Paten

and Chalice, the Bible, or the Gospels, the Pastoral Staff (to a Bishop),—all edifying ceremonies, but not essentials.

(III) Deacons.

A Deacon is a server. The word comes from the Greek *diakonos*, a servant, and exactly describes the Office. Originally, a permanent Order in the Church, the Diaconate is now, in the Church of England, generally regarded as a step to the Priesthood. This is a loss. But it is as this step, or preparatory stage, that we have to consider it.

Considering the importance of this first step in the Ministry, both to the man himself, and to the people, it is well that the laity should know what safeguards are taken by the Bishop to secure "fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of the Church"[1]—and should realize their own great responsibility in the matter. First, there is the age.

(1) *The Age.*

No layman can be made a Deacon under 23.

[1] Ember Collect.

(2) *The Preliminaries.*

The chief preliminary is the selection of the Candidate. The burden of selection is shared by the Bishop, Clergy and Laity. The Bishop must, of course, be the final judge of the Candidate's fitness, but *the evidence upon which he bases his judgment* must very largely be supplied by *the Laity.*

We pray in the Ember Collect that he "may lay hands suddenly on no man, but make choice of *fit persons*". It is well that the Laity should remember that they share with the Bishop and Clergy in the responsibility of choice.

For this fitness will, as in the case of the Priest, be moral and intellectual.

It will be *moral*—and it is here that the responsibility of the laity begins. For, in addition to private inquiries made by the Bishop, the laity are publicly asked, in the church of the parish where the Candidate resides, to bear testimony to the integrity of his character. This publication is called the *Si quis*, from the Latin of the first two words of publication ("if any . . ."), and it is repeated by the Bishop in open church in the Ordination Service. The

absence of any legal objection by the laity is the testimony of the people to the Candidate's fitness. This throws upon the laity a full share of responsibility in the choice of the Candidate. Their responsibility in giving evidence is only second to that of the Bishop, whose decision rests upon the evidence they give.

Then, there is the testimony of the Clergy. No layman is accepted by the Bishop for Ordination without *Letters Testimonial*—i.e. the testimony of three beneficed Clergymen, to whom he is well known. These Clergy must certify that "we have had opportunity of observing his conduct, and we do believe him, in our consciences, and as to his moral conduct, a fit person to be admitted to the Sacred Ministry". Each signature must be countersigned by the signatory's own Bishop, who thus guarantees the Clergyman's moral fitness to certify.

Lastly, comes the Bishop himself, who, from first to last, is in close touch with the Candidate, and who almost invariably helps to prepare him personally in his own house during the week before his Ordination.

It will be *intellectual.* In addition to University testimony, evidence of the Candidate's intel-

lectual fitness is given to the Bishop, as in the case of Priests, by his Examining Chaplains. Some months before the Ordination, the Candidate is examined, and the Examiner's Report sent in to the Bishop. The standard of intellectual fitness has differed at various ages, in different parts of the Church, and no one standard can be laid down. Assuming that the average proportion of people in a parish will be (on a generous calculation) as twelve Jurymen to one Judge, the layman called to the Diaconate should, at least, be equal in intellectual attainment to "the layman" called to the Bar.

It does sometimes happen that evidence is given by Clergy, or laity, which leads the Bishop to reject the Candidate on moral grounds. It does sometimes happen that the Candidate is rejected or postponed on intellectual grounds. It does, it must, sometimes happen that mistakes are made: God alone is infallible. But, if due care is taken, publicly and privately, and if the laity, as well as the Clergy, do their duty, the Bishop's risk of a wrong judgment is reduced to a very small minimum.

A "fit" Clergy is so much the concern of the laity, that they may well be reminded of their

parts and duties in the Ordination of a Deacon. For, as Dr. Liddon says, "the strength of the Church does not consist in the number of pages in its 'Clerical Directory,' but in the sum total of the moral and spiritual force which she has at her command".

CHAPTER XI.

PENANCE.

Sacraments of Recovery.

We deal now with the two last Sacraments under consideration—Penance and Unction. Both are Sacraments of healing. Penance is for the healing of the soul, and indirectly of the body: Unction is for the healing of the body, and indirectly of the soul.

"Every Sacrament," says St. Thomas Aquinas, "has been instituted to produce one special effect, although it may produce, as consequences, other effects besides." It is so with these two Sacraments. Body and Soul are so involved, that what directly affects the one must indirectly affect the other. Thus, the direct effect of Penance on the soul must indirectly affect the body, and the direct effect of Unction on the body must indirectly affect the soul. We will think of each in turn. First, Penance.

Penance.

The word is derived from the Latin *penitentia*, penitence, and its root-meaning (*pœna*, punishment) suggests a punitive element in all real repentance. It is used as a comprehensive term for confession of sin, punishment for sin, and the Absolution, or Remission of Sins. As Baptism was designed to recover the soul from original or inherited sin, so Penance was designed to recover the soul from actual or wilful sin. . . .[1] It is not, as in the case of infant Baptism, administered wholly irrespective of free will: it must be freely sought ("if he humbly and heartily desire it"[2]) before it can be freely bestowed. Thus, Confession must precede Absolution, and Penitence must precede and accompany Confession.

Confession.

Here we all start on common ground. We all agree upon one point, viz. the necessity of Confession (1) *to God* ("If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins")

[1] Cf. Rubric in the Baptismal Office.

[2] Rubric in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick.

and (2) *to man* ("Confess your faults one to another"). Further, we all agree that confession to man is in reality confession to God ("Against Thee, *Thee only*, have I sinned"). Our only ground of difference is, not *whether* we ought to confess, but *how* we ought to confess. It is a difference of method rather than of principle.

There are two ways of confessing sins (whether to God, or to man), the informal, and the formal. Most of us use one way; some the other; many both.

Informal Confession.—Thank God, I can use this way at any, and at every, moment of my life. If I have sinned, I need wait for no formal act of Confession; but, as I am, and where I am, I can make my Confession. Then, and there, I can claim the Divine response to the soul's threefold *Kyrie*: "Lord, have mercy upon me; Christ, have mercy upon me; Lord, have mercy upon me". But do I never want—does God never want—anything more than this? The soul is not always satisfied with such an easy method of going to Confession. It needs at times something more impressive, something less superficial, less easy-going. It demands more time for

deepening thought, and greater knowledge of what it has done, before sin's deadly hurt cuts deep enough to produce real repentance, and to prevent repetition. At such times, it cries for something more formal, more solemn, than instantaneous confession. It needs, what the Prayer Book calls, "a special Confession of sins".

Formal Confession.—Hence our Prayer Book provides two formal Acts of Confession, and suggests a third. Two of these are for public use, the third for private.

In Matins and Evensong, and in the Eucharistic Office, a form of "*general* confession" is provided. Both forms are in the first person plural throughout. Clearly, their primary intention is, not to make us merely think of, or confess, our own personal sins, but the sins of the Church,—and our own sins, as members of the Church. It is "we" have sinned, rather than "I" have sinned. Such formal language might, otherwise, at times be distressingly unreal,—when, e.g., not honestly feeling that the "burden" of our own personal sin "is intolerable," or when making a public Confession in church directly after a personal Confession in private.

In the Visitation of the Sick, the third mode of

formal Confession is suggested, though the actual words are naturally left to the individual penitent. The Prayer Book no longer speaks in the plural, or of "a *general* Confession," but it closes, as it were, with the soul, and gets into private, personal touch with it: "Here shall the sick man be moved to make a *special* Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which Confession, the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort". This Confession is to be both free and formal: formal, for it is to be made before the Priest in his "*ministerial*" capacity; free, for the penitent is to be "moved" (not "compelled") to confess. Notice, he *is* to be moved; but then (though not till then) he is free to accept, or reject, the proferred means of grace.

God never handcuffs Sacraments and souls. Sacraments are open to all; they are forced on none. They are love-tokens of the Sacred Heart; free-will offerings of His Royal Bounty.

These, then, are the two methods of Confession at our disposal. God is "the Father of an infinite Majesty". In *informal* Confession, the sinner goes to God as his *Father*,—as the Prodigal, after doing penance in the far country, went

to his father with "*Father*, I have sinned". In *formal* Confession, the sinner goes to God as to the Father of an *infinite Majesty*,—as David went to God through Nathan, God's ambassador.

It is a fearful responsibility to hinder any soul from using either method; it is a daring risk to say: "Because one method alone appeals to me, therefore no other method shall be used by you". God multiplies His methods, as He expands His love: and if any "David" is drawn to say "I have sinned" before the appointed "Nathan," and, through prejudice or ignorance, such an one is hindered from so laying his sins on Jesus, God will require that soul at the hinderer's hands.

Absolution.

It is the same with Absolution as with Confession. Here, too, we start on common ground. All agree that "*God only* can forgive sins," and half our differences come because this is not recognized. Whatever form Confession takes, the penitent exclaims: "*To Thee only it appertaineth to forgive sins*". Pardon through the Precious Blood is the one, and only, source of

forgiveness. Our only difference, then, is as to God's *methods* of forgiveness. How does God forgive sin? Some seem to limit His love, to tie forgiveness down to one, and only one, method of absolution—direct, personal, instantaneous, without any ordained Channel such as Christ left. Direct, God's pardon certainly is; personal and instantaneous, it certainly can be; without any sacramental *media*, it certainly may be. But we dare not limit what God has not limited; we dare not deny the existence of ordained channels, because God can, and does, act without such channels. He has opened an ordained fountain for sin and uncleanness as a superadded gift of love, and in the Ministry of reconciliation He conveys pardon through this channel.

At the most solemn moment of his life, when a Deacon is ordained Priest, the formal terms of his Commission to the Priesthood run thus: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." "*Now* committed unto thee." No Priest dare hide his commission, play with

the plain meaning of the words, or conceal from others a "means of grace" which they have a blessed right to know of, and to use.

But what is the good of this Absolution, if God can forgive without it? God's ordinances are never meaningless. There must, therefore, be some superadded grace attached to this particular ordinance. It was left to be used. It is not left merely to comfort the penitent (though that it does), nor to let him hear from a fellow-sinner that his sins are forgiven him (though that he does); but it is left, like any other Sacrament, as a special means of grace. It is the ordained Channel whereby God's pardon is conveyed to (and only to) the penitent sinner. "No penitence, no pardon," is the law of Sacramental Absolution.

The Prayer Book, therefore, preaches the power of formal, as well as informal, Absolution. There are in it three forms of Absolution, varying in words but the same in power. The appropriating power of the penitent may, and does, vary, according to the sincerity of his confession: Absolution is in each case the same. It is man's capacity to receive it, not God's power in giving it, that varies. Thus, all three Absolutions in the

Prayer Book are of the same force, though our appropriating capacity in receiving them may differ. This capacity will probably be less marked at Matins and Evensong than at Holy Communion, and at Holy Communion than in private Confession, because it will be less personal, less thorough. The words of Absolution seem to suggest this. The first two forms are in the plural ("pardon and deliver *you*"), and are thrown, as it were, broadcast over the Church: the third is special ("forgive *thee* thine offences") and is administered to the individual. But the formal act is the same in each case; and to stroll late into church, as if the Absolution in Matins and Evensong does not matter, may be to incur a very distinct loss.

When, and how often, formal "special Confession" is to be used, and formal Absolution to be sought, is left to each soul to decide. The two special occasions which the Church of England emphasizes (without limiting) are before receiving the Holy Communion, and when sick.

Before Communion, the Prayer Book counsels its use for any disquieted conscience; and the

Rubric which directs intending Communicants to send in their names to the Parish Priest the day before making their Communion, still bears witness to its framers' intention—that known sinners might not be communicated without first being brought to a state of repentance.

The sick, also, after being directed to make their wills,[1] and arrange their temporal affairs, are further urged to examine their spiritual state; to make a special confession; and to obtain the special grace, in the special way provided for them. And, adds the Rubric, "men should often be put in remembrance to take order for the settling of their temporal estates, while they are in health" —and if of the temporal, how much more of their spiritual estate.

Direction.

But, say some, is not all this very weakening to the soul? They are, probably, mixing up two things,—the Divine Sacrament of forgiveness which (rightly used) must be strengthening, and the human appeal for direction which (wrongly used) may be weakening.

[1] Rubric in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick.

But "direction" is not necessarily part of Penance. The Prayer Book lays great stress upon it, and calls it "ghostly counsel and advice," but it is neither Confession nor Absolution. It has its own place in the Prayer Book;[1] but it has not, necessarily, anything whatever to do with the administration of the Sacrament. Direction may, or may not, be good for the soul. It largely depends upon the character of the penitent, and the wisdom of the Director. It is quite possible for the priest to over-direct, and it is fatally possible for the penitent to think more of direction than of Absolution. It is quite possible to obscure the Sacramental side of Penance with a human craving for "ghostly counsel and advice". Satan would not be Satan if it were not so. But this "ghostly," or spiritual, "counsel and advice" has saved many a lad, and many a man, from many a fall; and when rightly sought, and wisely given is, as the Prayer Book teaches, a most helpful adjunct to Absolution. Only, it is not, necessarily, a part of "going to Confession".

[1] See the First Exhortation in the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion.

Indulgences.

The abuse of the Sacrament is another, and not unnatural objection to its use; and it often gets mixed up with Mediæval teaching about Indulgences.

An *Indulgence* is exactly what the word suggests—the act of indulging, or granting a favour. In Roman theology, an Indulgence is the remission of temporal punishment due to sin after Absolution. It is either "plenary," i.e. when the whole punishment is remitted, or "partial," when some of it is remitted. At corrupt periods of Church history, these Indulgences have been bought for money,[1] thus making one law for the rich, and another for the poor. Very naturally, the scandals connected with such buying and selling raised suspicions against the Sacrament with which Indulgences were associated.[2] But Indulgences have nothing in the world to do with the right use of the lesser Sacrament of Penance.

[1] St. Peter's at Rome was largely built out of funds gained by the sale of indulgences.

[2] The Council of Trent orders that Indulgences must be granted by Pope and Prelate *gratis*.

Amendment.

The promise of Amendment is an essential part of Penance. It is a necessary element in all true contrition. Thus, the penitent promises "true amendment" before he receives Absolution. If he allowed a priest to give him Absolution without firmly purposing to amend, he would not only invalidate the Absolution, but would commit an additional sin. The promise to amend may, like any other promise, be made and broken; but the deliberate purpose must be there.

No better description of true repentance can be found than in Tennyson's "Guinevere":—

> *For what is true repentance but in thought—*
> *Not ev'n in inmost thought to think again*
> *The sins that made the past so pleasant to us.*

Such has been the teaching of the Catholic Church always, everywhere, and at all times: such is the teaching of the Church of England, as part of that Church, and as authoritatively laid down in the Book of Common Prayer.

God alone can forgive sins. Absolution is the conveyance of God's pardon to the penitent sinner by God's ordained Minister, through the ordained Ministry of Reconciliation.

Lamb of God, the world's transgression
Thou alone canst take away;
Hear! oh! hear our heart's confession,
And Thy pardoning grace convey.
Thine availing intercession
We but echo when we pray.

CHAPTER XII.

UNCTION.

THE second Sacrament of Recovery is *Unction*, or, in more familiar language, "the Anointing of the Sick". It is called by Origen "the complement of Penance".

The meaning of the Sacrament is found in St. James v. 14-17. "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Here the Bible states that the "Prayer of Faith" with Unction is more effective than the "Prayer of Faith" without Unction. What can it do?

It can do two things. It can (1) recover the body, and (2) restore the soul. Its primary ob-

ject seems to be to recover the body ; but it also, according to the teaching of St. James, restores the soul. First, he says, Anointing with the Prayer of Faith heals the body ; and then, because of the inseparable union between body and soul, it cleanses the soul.

Thus, as the object of Penance is primarily to heal the soul, and indirectly to heal the body ; so the object of Unction is primarily to heal the body, and indirectly to heal the soul.

The story of Unction may be summarized very shortly. It was instituted in Apostolic days, when the Apostles "anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them" (St. Mark VI. 13). It was continued in the Early Church, and perpetuated during the Middle Ages, when its use (by a "*corrupt*[1] following of the Apostles") was practically limited to the preparation of the dying instead of (by a *correct* "following of the Apostles") being used for the recovery of the living. In our 1549 Prayer Book an authorized Office was appointed for its use, but this, lest it should be misused, was omitted in 1552. And although, as Bishop Forbes says, "everything of that earlier Liturgy was praised by those who

[1] Article XXV.

removed it," it has not yet been restored. It is "one of the lost Pleiads" of our present Prayer Book. But, as Bishop Forbes adds, "there is nothing to hinder the revival of the Apostolic and Scriptural Custom of Anointing the Sick whenever any devout person desires it".[1]

Extreme Unction.

An unhistoric use of the name partly explains the unhistoric use of the Sacrament. *Extreme*, or last (*extrema*) Unction has been taken to mean the anointing of the sick when *in extremis*. This, as we have seen, is a "corrupt," and not a correct, "following of the Apostles". The phrase *Extreme* Unction means the extreme, or last, of a series of ritual Unctions, or anointings, once used in the Church. The first Unction was in Holy Baptism, when the Baptized were anointed with Holy Oil: then came the anointing in Confirmation: then in Ordination; and, last of all, the anointing of the sick. Of this last anointing, it is written: "All Christian men should account, and repute the said manner of anointing among the other Sacraments, forasmuch as it is a visible sign of an invisible grace".[2]

[1] "Forbes on the Articles" (xxv.).

[2] "Institution of a Christian Man."

Its Administration.

It must be administered under the Scriptural conditions laid down in St. James v. 14-16. The first condition refers to :—

(1) *The Minister.*—The Minister is *the Church*, in her corporate capacity. Scripture says to the sick : "Let him call for the Elders," or Presbyters, "of the Church". The word is in the plural ; it is to be the united act of the whole Church. And, further, there must be nothing secret about it, as if it were either a charm, or something to be ashamed of, or apologized for. It may have to be done in a private house, but it is to be done by no private person.[1] "Let him call for the elders."

(2) *The Manner.*—The Elders are to administer Sacrament not in their own name (any more than the Priest gives Absolution in his own name), but "in the Name of the Lord".

(3) *The Method.*—The sick man is to be anointed (either on the afflicted part, or in other ways), *with prayer:* "Let them pray over him". Prayer is essential.

[1] In the Greek Church, seven, or at least three, Priests must be present.

(4) *The Matter.*—Oil—"anointing him with oil". As in Baptism, sanctified water is the ordained matter by which "Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin"; so in Unction, consecrated oil is the ordained matter used by the Holy Ghost to cleanse us from all sickness—bodily, and (adds St. James) spiritual. "And if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

For this latter purpose, there are two Scriptural requirements: *Confession* and *Intercession.* For it follows: "Confess your faults one to another, and pray for one another that ye may be healed". Thus it is with Unction as with other Sacraments; with the "last" as with the first—special grace is attached to special means. The Bible says that, under certain conditions, oil and prayer together will effect more than either oil or prayer apart; that oil without prayer cannot, and prayer without oil will not, win the special grace of healing guaranteed to the use of oil and prayer together.

In our days, the use of anointing with prayer is (in alliance with, and in addition to, Medical Science) being more fully recognized. "The Prayer of Faith" is coming into its own, and is being placed once more in proper position in the

sphere of healing; *anointing* is being more and more used "according to the Scriptures". Both are being used together in a simple belief in revealed truth. It often happens that "the elders of the Church" are sent for by the sick; a simple service is used; the sick man is anointed; the united "Prayer of Faith" (it *must* be "of Faith") is offered; and, if it be good for his spiritual health, the sick man is "made whole of whatsoever disease he had".

God give us in this, as in every other Sacrament, a braver, quieter, more loving faith in His promises. The need still exists: the grace is still to be had.

If our love were but more simple,
We should take Him at His word;
And our lives would be all sunshine
In the sweetness of our Lord.

INDEX.

A.

Absolution, 149.
Adoption, 76.
Affusion, 65.
Altar, 86.
Amendment, 156.
Anointing, 104, 158.
Aspersion, 65.
Augustine, St., 3, 12, 13, 49.

B.

Baptism, Sacrament of, 63.
  Forms of administration, 65.
  Ministry of, 65.
Bible, the, names of, 21.
  Inspiration of, 34.
  Interpretation of, 23.
  MSS., 26.
  Versions, 32.
Bishops, 124.
  Their Confirmation, 127.
    ,, Consecration, 127.
    ,, Election, 126.
    ,, Homage, 128.
    ,, Nomination, 126.
Books, the Church's, 21.
Breviary, 44.
Bright, Dr., 8.

C.

Chrism, 67.
Christian name, 73.
Church, the, names of—
  Catholic, 2.
  Church of England, 12.
  Established, 7.
  National, 4.
  Primitive, 17.
  Protestant, 18.
  Reformed, 14.
Clergymen, 134.
Communion, Holy, 82.
Confession, 145.
Confirmation, 94.
  Age, 101.
  Essentials, 103.
  Names of, 104.
  New name at, 73.
  Sacrament of completion, 93.
Consecration, 83, 91.
Consignation, 68.
Consubstantiation, 84.

Criticism, 36.
Higher, 36.
Historical, 36.
Lower, 36.

D.

Deacons, ordination of, 139.
Age of, 139.
Laity and responsibility, 140.
Preparation of, 140.
Direction, 153.
Discipline, 54.
Dissenters and Confirmation, 99.

E.

Election, 78.
Endowments, 11.
Established Church, 7.
Eucharist, 81.
Extreme Unction, 160.

F.

Faith and Prayer with oil, 162.

G.

God-parents, 65.
Gospels, the, 44.
Gradual, the, 44.

H.

Holy Orders, 123.
Homage of Bishops, 128.

I.

Illingworth, Dr., 61.
Immersion, 65, 67.
Indulgences, 155.
Inspiration, 34.
Interpretation of Scripture, 23.

J.

Jurisdiction, 129.

K.

Kings and Bishops, 126, 128.

L.

Laity responsible for ordination of deacons, 140.
Lesser Sacraments, 92.
Liddon, Dr., 143.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 124.
Liturgy, 81.

M.

Marriage, 106.
A Sacrament, 107, 110.
Affinity, 116.
Age, 117.
By banns, 118.
By licence, 119.
Consanguinity, 116.
Deceased wife's sister, 117.
Divorce, 108.
False names, 121.
In registry office, 110.
Who for, 107, 113, 116.

Manual, the, 44.
Manuscripts of the Bible, 26.
Mass, 81.
Matter, 61.
Minister, 132.
Missal, the, 43.

N.

Name, Christian, 73.
Nonconformists and Holy Communion, 99.

O.

Oil, Holy, 159.
Orders, Holy, 123.
  Bishops, 124.
  Deacons, 139.
  Indelibility of, 136.
  Priests, 130.

P.

Parson, 133.
Penance, 145.
Perpetuation, Sacraments of, 93.
Pontifical, the, 43.
Prayer Book, 40.
  Its contents, 50.
  „ preface, 47.
  „ title, 42.
Priesthood, 130.
Primitive Church, 7.
Protestant Church, 18.

R.

Reconciliation, ministry of 145.
Recovery, Sacrament of, 93, 145.
Reformed Church, 14.
Regeneration, 75.
Revelation, 37.

S.

Sacraments, 58.
  Their names, 62.
    „ nature, 60.
    „ number, 59.
  The Blessed Sacrament, 81.
  The lesser, 92.
Sacrifice, 82, 87.
Sanday, Dr., 35.
Scriptures, the, 26.
Sects, 9.
Spiritualities and Temporalities, 128.
Sponsors, 65.
Stubbs, Bishop, 8, 10.
Supper, the Lord's, 82.

T.

Table, the Holy, 88.
Threefold Ministry, 124.
Transubstantiation, 83, 84.
Trine immersion, 67.

U.

Unction, Extreme, 160.
Unction, Holy, 159.

W.

Word of God, 31.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Date Due

MAR 03			
MAR 29 12			
MAY 05			

Demco 38-297

T. Wover
Antiquaria

Duke University Libraries
D00738409V

Duke- LSC
D00738409V